COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Redwood City	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter: 8
Inspected by: J. Libby		Date: 06/04/2009

Page 1 of 2

rage 1012			
number of the inspection in the Chapter	Inspecti docume	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or foon number. Under "Forward to:" enter the neent shall be utilized to document innovative praction plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be	ractices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command L Executive Office Level	No. at Fa	Total hours expended on the inspection:	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☑ No	Forwa		
Chapter/Inspection Inspector's Comments Regar	ding Ir	inovative Practices:	
Command Suggestions for St Currently, there is no AIS entry criteria for Cost Recovery.	atewic which	le Improvement: n allows for tracking of non-collisio	on DUI arrests which meet the
Inspector's Findings:			
An Inspection of procedures by was conducted on June 4, 200 The Area Management team, A procedures involved in the procedures a spreadsheet to the proper and timely sensure the proper and timely sensure.	9. The Admini cessing track C ubmiss	CHP 735's. Management has follo sion of CHP 735's.	on events requiring a CHP 735. If understand the proper ow up procedures in place to
	177	ea is initiating training to ensure p	
Commander's Response: 🛛	Concu	r or 🗌 Do Not Concur (Do Not Conc	our shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall a etc.)	ddress	non concurrence by commander (e.g., fi	ndings revised, findings unchanged,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: Redwood City	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter: 8
Inspected by:		Date: 06/04/2009

DATE

Required Action		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Met 50 (CO) (Delta) (Control of the Control of the	• 4
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		
		*
		12
Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer.	Lollwan	7/7/09
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	TOTAL SIGNATURE	DATE //

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE

employee

Concur

Reviewer discussed this report with

Do not concur

> 8	aq	е	

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command:	Division:	Number:	
Redwood City	Golden Gate	330	
Evaluated by:		Date:	
Tina Cook, AGPA		6/2/09	
Assisted by:		Date:	
Kelly Kettell		6/2/2009	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

	TYPE OF	INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signat	ure:	
	🖾 Div	vision Level [☐ Command Level				
	_		☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection				
	F	ollow-up Required:	Follow-Up Inspection	Commande	er's Signature	1:	Date:
		Yes 🛛 No	BY:	1-1	Jakan.		7/-/09
,				1	twin_		
	For a	oplicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.		111 CONT. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		o a construir a
1	Note:	If a "No" or "N/A" boxtis che	cked the Remarks section	shall be ut	ilizeditorie	xpianation	
	1.	Prior to the performance of contracting party informed services, departmental equancellation policy?	of the rates charged for	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	2,	Does the billing rate include expenses such as uniform	le mileage and other or equipment damage?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
•	3.	When a safety service is pagency, is the agency's fivoltained?	rovided to another state	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Only 1 of the 20 records inspected falls under this requirement and code was obtained.
	4.	Is the billing code docume Services Billing Memorano	nted on the Reimbursable lum?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Only 1 of the 20 records inspected falls under this requirement, but the billing code was not present.
-	5.	Is \$50 charged for each Classigned to the detail if the less than 24 hours prior to	cancellation notification is	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:
	6.	Is a minimum payment of 4 when employee(s) could n cancellation of their service	hours overtime charged of be notified of the	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	7.	Is information regarding the necessary right-of-way clear requirements, and other per available to inquiring partie	e procedures to obtain arances or permits, local ertinent information made	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area is unfamiliar with local requirements.
	8.	Are written requests for spetthe appropriate command?	ecific services directed to	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
-	9.	Are traffic control services approved by Division?	less than \$50,000	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
_	10.	Are traffic control services more approved by the Offic	estimated to be \$50,000 or	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
-	11.	Are extraordinary protective Assistant Commissioner, F	e services approved by the	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

Questions 1/24through 1/7 pertain to collecting advance de	oosits.			
12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agree	ements)			
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22. Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area has copies in file, which was the policy prior to the February 2009 revision of policy.
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks: Area proceeds with RSAs, but does not ensure permits are obtained.
25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	Yes	Пио	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to any records reviewed. Area is aware of requirement.
29. Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No Statewide agreements used.
31. When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pro	oedures a	nd reporti	ng/for se	rvices provided
32. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
33. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
34. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
35. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
36. Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
37. Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
38. Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protective special projects:	erservices	and repo	rt of over	time nours for reimbursable
39. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
40. Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
41. Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
42. Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43. Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
44. Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No SPCs used for RSAs other than 63, 50, and COZEEP/MAZEEP.
45. Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No SPCs used for RSAs other than 63, 50, and COZEEP/MAZEEP.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

46. Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No SPCs used for RSAs other than 63, 50, and COZEEP/MAZEEP.
47. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: 12 of 20 records were submitted by the 15 th of each month. ~ Delays caused by extension of cutoff for timekeeping.
48. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
49. Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
50. Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
51. Are all payments made directly to FMS?	∑ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
52. Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	⊠ Yes	□No	□N/A	Remarks: If Command is aware of delinquency.

REDWOOD CITY AREA

Number of Records Inspected:	20			
Inspected Information	Yes	No	N/A	Remarks
Agency Billing Code included on CHP	, 03	140	14//4	Retidiks
467 for Safety Services to other state				
agencies.		1	40	A
\$50 or 4 hour Cancellation claimed			19	Agency billing code was provided by other state agency, but not included on CHP 467.
when appropriate.	1		19	Only one record reviewed indicated cancellation of details and the cancellation time was
RSA Number present on Paperwork	20		19	claimed as appropriate.
CHP 465 Completed	20			
Advance Deposit Obtained.	13			
	13	6	1	Either advance deposit (7) or purchase order # (6) obtained.
CHP 251 completed and mailed to				Could not verify on one of the advance deposits as there was no paperwork with weekly
contracting company	6	1		transmittal.
CHP 467 completed and submitted to				
FMS	20			All 20 were completed, but none had SPC code noted.
Copy of CHP 465 and, if applicable, CHP 169 attached to weekly transmittal	_6	1		One of the 7 advance deposits received did not have the paperwork with the weekly transmittal.
Copy of resolution, order, motion or ordinance of local governing body obtained if contractor is county, city,	5			
district or other local public body.		1	19	Only one record inspected falls under this policy. No resolution obtained.
CHP 312 and CHP 313 completed for				Only one record inspected was for detail with other state agency. CHP 312 and 313 not
RSA with state agency		1	19	completed.
				Late submissions were from 6 to 20 days after end of detail. On time submissions were
CHP 467 submitted within 5 days	12	8		from 1-5 days, with 9 of the 12 less than 3 days.
Original CHP 465 at Area	20			
SPC obtained/used for every R-Number				
and Statewide Contract	20			Although an SPC was used for each detail, two details had the wrong code used.
Reconciliation reports used to reconcile				, see a see and though dood.
SPCs other than 50, 63, and 633 for		1	1	
RSAs.			20	
Reports signed, dated by commander and submitted by 10th to FMS			20	None of the records inspected fell under this policy. This is for RSAs that use SPCs other than 63, 50 or 633.

R-Numbers on CHP 467s match				
numbers on log.	20			
Permits obtained		19	1	None of the records inspected referenced permits, not even the two film details.
Other remarks: Area is not providing				The state of periation, they even the two thirt details.
information regarding the prodedures to		}		(4)
obtain necessary right-of-way-				
clearances or permits, local		1		€
requirements, and other pertinent				
information made availbe to inquiring				
parties because they do not have				
knowledge of				

COZEEP/MAZEEP Records Inspected.	20			*
Inspection Information	Yes	No	N/A	Remarks
SPC Used for OT	20			
\$50 or 4 hour cancellation claimed when appropriate.	20			
Reconcilation report reconciled with 415s	20			
SPCs verified	20			
Corrections noted on Reconcilation Reports	20			
Reconciliation reports approved and dated by by Commander.	20			
Original forwarded to Division by 15th.	10	10		Half of the records inspected were signed and submitted to Division after the 15th of the month. This was most likely due to repeated extensions of cut-off for time keeping, which causes the reports to print later in the month than they should.

AREA: Redwood City 330

TOTAL RECORDS: 209

RECORDS EXAMINED: 20

			10000	ARREST FOR					
DATE OF	DATE 735	BAC/DRUG	ARREST FOR DUI	OTHER	D. 7	CONVICTION	415	415	
ARREST	SUBMITTED	RESULTS	T/C Y/N	EVENT	DATE BAC	DATE IF	ATTACHED		
6/16/2008	7/28/2008	0.19	Y		AVAILABLE	APPLICABLE	Y/N	Y/N	NOTES
6/21/2008	7/9/2008	.09/.09	Y	N	7/25/2008		Y	Y	
6/22/2008	7/8/2008	0.22		N	6/21/2008		Y	Υ	
6/22/2008			Y	N	7/3/2008		Υ	Υ	
	7/8/2008	.08/.07	Υ	N	6/22/2008		Υ	Y	
11/15/2008	11/26/2008	0.00	Υ	N	11/26/2008		Y	Y	
11/16/2008	11/19/2008	.20/.20	Y	N	11/16/2008		Y	Y	
11/16/2008		refusal	Υ	N			Y	Y	DA reject.
11/20/2008	11/26/2008	.19/.18	Y	N	11/20/2008		Y	Y	
11/22/2008	5/18/2009	.07/.07	Y	N	11/22/2008	2/13/2009	N	N.	415's missing-had previously been sent.
3/7/2009	3/25/2009	0.19	Y	N	3/19/2009		Y	Y	1703 Missing-had previously been sent.
3/7/2009		0.07	Y	N	3/25/2009	pending	Y	Y	In file awaiting DA filing.
3/7/2009			Y	N			N	——·-	CHP 735 not in file. BAC not in AlS.
3/8/2009	3/31/2009	0.12	Y	N	3/25/2009		Y	Y	TOO HOURT RIE. DAC HOURT AIS.
3/13/2009	3/20/2009	.19/.19	Y	N	3/14/2009		Y	Ý	Arrest before 001 hours, BAC after 001.
5/17/2009	5/18/2009	.23/.23	Y	N	5/17/2009		Y	Y	7 treat before out flours, DAC after 001
5/17/2009	5/28/2009	0.16	Y	N	5/28/2009		Y	Y	***************************************
5/17/2009	5/28/2009	0.10	Y	N	5/28/2009		Y	Ÿ	
5/21/2009		pending	Y	N	pending		Ÿ	Ÿ	In file awaiting BAC results.
5/22/2009		0.25	Y	N	6/4/2009		Ý	V	In file awaiting managerial review
5/23/2009		0.09	Y	N	6/4/2009	1	Y	Y	
		- 5.55		<u> </u>	01412009	 		<u> </u>	In file awaiting managerial review
		L	J						

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

$\Box \land$.)	1 1	\cup	140	ميار	_	_	IV
-		_	-	`				

Page 1 of	_
-----------	---

Command: Redwood City	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter: 8
Inspected by:	Date:	
Tina Cook	6/2/2009	

number of the inspection in the Chapter	Inspecti docume	on number. Under "Forward to: enter tr ent shall be utilized to document innovati	y, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter the next level of command where the document ive practices, suggestions for statewide may be used if additional space is required.				
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command Level Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection:	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included				
Follow-up Required:	Forwa						
	Chapter Inspection Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:						
Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement:							
Inspector's Findings:							
were inspected. Office Technic	cian Ko aemer	elly Kettell manages the Area nt and is trained. Only minor e	between May 2008 and May 2009 RSC program. She routinely errors were noted and those were the omission of billing codes or				
The Cozeep and Mazeep repo							
Commander's Response: 🔯	Concu	r or 🗌 Do Not Concur (Do Not (Concur shall document basis for response)				
3							
Inspector's Comments: Shall a etc.)	ddress	non concurrence by commander (e.	g., findings revised, findings unchanged,				

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: Redwood City	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter: 8
Inspected by:		Date: 6/2/2009

.85		manus alim			are processing
:	DOLLARS COMMISSION NOS COMMISSION NAMED DE	0.00031235-0.0051622019955-00355	ENTACKPOOR INTO	ucajana 30 m	referencia de la constanta de
Required/Actions (Fig. 1)			是是这种的种类。	termode in the saw	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline					
None required.					
•					

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE -7/-7/09
(OCC TIT WI CTT, OTTAINED OF A APPEAR	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE/ //
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

Command: Redwood City	Division: Golden Gate	Number: 330	
Evaluated by: Sergeant J. Lib	Date: 06/04/2009		
Assisted by: Sergeant M. Ot	Date: 6/4/2009		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspendent of the inspe	nted on an n and/or co	Exceptions I	Document a on(s) taken	and addressed to the next level of a. If this form is used as a Follow-		
	Lead inspe	ector's Signati	ure:			
TYPE OF INSPECTION Command Level Command Level						
☐ Office of Inspections ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection						
Follow-up Required:	Command	er's Signature	•	Dale: 7/7/09 -		
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20.	d			77		
Note: If a "No" on "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	planation	Section 1997		
Does the command have sufficient procedures to ensure that a CHP 735, Incident Response Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N⁄A	Remarks:		
2. What are these procedures?	L	l		•		
After the investigating officer submits the arrest report, the reviewing sergeant verifies whether or not a CHP 735 is required, and if so, if the CHP 735 has been properly submitted. The CHP 735 is forwarded to the arrest report office assistant, and the arrest report is then forwarded to the Court Officer. A copy of the arrest report is stamped "Cost Recovery" by the court officer and forwarded to the arrest report office assistant. CHP 735's ready for managerial review are placed in a folder with an AIS printout listing the enclosed CHP 735's, and are reviewed by the Commander or designee. After signature, they are forwarded to FMS. CHP 735's pending BAC results or District Attorney filing are placed in folders marked as such, with AIS printouts on each of the respective folders. As BAC results arrive, or criminal charges are filed or rejected, the CHP 735 is moved from its current file to the managerial review file. The file number on the AIS printout is then lined out and AIS is updated. This system is backed up by spreadsheets showing outstanding CHP 735's.						
Does the command have a specific employee(s) assigned to process all CHP 735 forms?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:		
4. If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms listed in their job description or any other document?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:		

INSPECTION PROGRAM

		T	1		
5.	Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: #
6.		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks;
7.		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
8.	Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:
9.	Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
	If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: There have been no reported arrests of transients.
11.	Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:
12.	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	⊠ Yes	□No	□N/A	Remarks:

Page

3 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

13	Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	⊠Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Officers indicate the name of the in-custody in report time.
14.	Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Response time is not consistently included in the CHP 735.
15.	Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□N⁄A	Remarks:
19.	In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command tra a uses updated AIS printouts, as well as spreadsheets,				
	Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information FMS Information BAC test results	⊠ Yes	□No	□N/A	Remarks:
1	Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	\$1\$\$ \$2 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$				

INSPECTION PROGRAM

22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area does not process CHP 735 overpayments.
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Question:25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section:		Toy have		
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

Memorandum

Date:

August 17, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Contra Costa Area

File No.:

320.10458.13731.ch8

Subject:

CHAPTER 8 INSPECTION FINDINGS - CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

A Division level inspection of the Contra Costa Area Reimbursable Services program was completed on June 3, 2009. The inspection team found that Area had failed to consistently forward a completed CHP 312 or CHP 313 with each CHP 467 submitted to Fiscal Management Section. In addition, Area had previously entered into a reimbursable contract with a local government entity without first obtaining a resolution, order, or motion. Area immediately established procedures for the appropriate documenting of reimbursable activities and the obtaining of appropriate resolutions or orders prior to entering into contracts with local government.

A Division level inspection of the Contra Costa Area DUI Cost Recovery program was also completed on June 3, 2009. The inspection team found that Area Standard Operating Procedure required updating regarding the proper documenting on the CHP A415 of billable hours, that Area needed to begin noting the date that the completed CHP 735 was sent to Fiscal Management Section by using the space provided, that the Front Desk Officer needed to review the status of pending DUI cases on a weekly basis, and that Area needed to develop a process for closing and purging cases that had not resulted in conviction 12 months after submission to the District Attorney. Area immediately updated Standard Operating Procedure as recommended and instituted processes to comply with the additional findings.

Should you have any questions concerning the contents of this memorandum, please contact medirectly at (925) 646-4980. In my absence, Lieutenant Mills may address your concerns.

J. U. CAHOON, Captain

Commander

Attachment(s)

Memorandum

Date:

June 5, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Golden Gate Division

File No.:

365.14402

Subject:

CHAPTER 8 INSPECTIONS - CONTRA COSTA AREA

On June 3, 2009, Golden Gate Division Inspection Team #3; Lt. Shon Harris, Sgt. Braden Moffett, and SSA Jennifer Manlutac inspected Contra Costa Area's in-house DUI cost recovery and Reimbursable Services Agreement procedures. The inspection team was assisted by Contra Costa Area Lt. Steve Mills (Field Operations Officer) and Officer Kyle Pacheco.

The inspection team reviewed a random sample consisting of ten percent of Area's CHP 735s from the previous 12 months and subsequently made the following findings:

Area notes actual BAC results on the CHP 735 rather than only the date they are received as required. If the BAC returns under 0.08%, this practice serves as an alert to responsible personnel to hold the case in suspense rather than close it out as it could possibly still meet Section B criteria if the results indicate that a conviction for 23152(a) may be likely.

Area SOP needs to be further updated to provide specific direction relating to CHP 415 entries. (Note: This discrepancy was immediately corrected by the FOO who is in the process of revising the entire SOP).

Area has failed to note the specific date that cases are forwarded to FMS which prevents local monitoring of the required 10-day turn around time.

It is recommended that the CHP 375 coordinator follow-up on cases with pending BAC results and/or conviction status on a weekly basis rather than the current practice of doing so monthly.

Recommend that the CHP 735 coordinator enter every case into the CHP 735 log rather than only cases that have been forwarded to FMS.

Area was unaware that cases that have not resulted in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney should be closed out. Recommend that they begin doing so as outlined in HPM 11.1.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 June 5, 2009

Ten of Contra Costa Area's 24 Reimbursable Services Agreements were reviewed. Area has an effective system in place to ensure all RSAs are processed in a timely fashion and in compliance with policy.

The inspection team provides the following reminders to ensure full compliance with policy:

When a county, city, district, or other local public body, desires to enter into a RSA, remember to obtain a copy of the appropriate resolution, order or motion that permits the public body to enter into a RSA.

When preparing the CHP 467 to send to FMS, remember to attach the CHP 312 (SSP Task Order) and/or a CHP 313 (SSP Daily Report).

All issues are in the process of being remedied by the FOO and Area Commander. It is expected that corrective measures will be in place by June 15, 2009.

Shon L. Harris

Lieutenant

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Contra Costa	Golden Gate	۱ ۵
Inspected by:	Date:06/03/09	
Lt. Shon Harris	To the second of the second se	

Division:

Chapter:

Page 1 of 3					
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall the number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co.	Inspecti docum	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to doc	ard to:" enter the ne cument innovative p	fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter ext level of command where the document ractices, suggestions for statewide we used if additional space is required.	
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command L Executive Office Level	_evel	Total hours expended inspection:	d on the	□ Corrective Action Plan Included □ Attachments Included	
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	ard to:			
Yes □ No	Due D	Pate:	0 10 107.4		
Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: When they are received, Area enters the actual BAC results on the CHP 735 in addition to the date the results are received. While this information is not currently required on the CHP 735, it could serve as an alert to the CHP 735 coordinator to suspense the case while awaiting a possible conviction for 23152(a) rather than closing out the case altogether. Particularly in cases where the suspect had a BAC that was close to 0.08%, the case would then essentially convert to one submitted under Section B criteria.					
Command Suggestions for S	tatewic	de Improvement:			
Inspector's Findings:	-kg)				
THE PARTY OF THE P					

Command:

The inspection team randomly reviewed 10% of Contra Costa Area's CHP 735s that were submitted between June 3, 2008 and June 3, 2009. Additionally, Area SOP and other supporting documents were reviewed. Field Operations Lieutenant Steve Mills provided guidance, documentation, and answered any questions that surfaced during the inspection. The inspection team made the following findings:

Area SOP adequately explains the CHP 735 process and expectations for Area officers' purposes. SOP does need to be updated to include a requirement that officers include the defendant's name and the case number on each line entry that documents billable time.

Area has not recorded the date that FMS was sent a completed CHP 735 on the Area copy of the CHP 735 or the CHP 735A log. Generally, the date the FOO signed the CHP 735 has been used as a guide to ascertain the date it was sent to FMS. Per FMS, an average of 21 days elapses from the time BAC results are known and/or the conviction is obtained until the completed CHP 735 is received by FMS. The FOO is aware of the issue and has been taking an active roll in lowering the average. He has identified the Area supervisors as a key link in the process and has addressed the issue at Area staff

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Contra Costa	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by: Lt. Shon Harris		Date:06/03/09

Page 2 of 3

meetings. He expects the next quarterly report from FMS to show a significant decrease in the turnaround time.

Currently, the front desk officer checks conviction status and/or BAC results on a monthly basis. Recommend that this be completed weekly.

When forwarded a case that meets the criteria for cost recovery, the front desk officer only enters cases that are ready for submission to FMS into the CHP 735A log. Recommend that area enter every case on the CHP 735A which would create a single-source for monitoring the progress of all CHP 735s. Additionally, an entry into the CHP 735A log would enable proper closing out of all cases that have been pending for over 12 months.

Area does not have a process in place to close out cases that have been pending for over 12 months; they are held in suspense indefinitely. Recommend that area begin closing out cases if a conviction has not resulted within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney. Closed out cases should be documented as such consistent with HPM 11.1.

Recommend the Department consider editing the CHP 735 to include a mechanism to designate a CHP 735 as a "Supplemental." This would allow additional billable time to be added at a later date if applicable. For example, if a particular collision requires extensive follow-up and the suspect provided a breath sample, thereby requiring the submission of all billable time within ten days, the option of submitting supplemental investigation time at a later date would allow the Area to meet time constraints by submitting a preliminary CHP 735.

Commander's Response:
Concur or Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)

nspector's Comments:	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged
etc.)	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command:	Division	Chapler:
Contra Costa	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:		Date: 06/03/09
Lt. Shon Harris		i

Required Action	
	(disposal form)
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	

- ~ Update Area SOP as specified above.
- ~ Begin noting the date that a completed CHP 735 was sent to FMS.
- ~ Front desk officer to monitor the conviction/BAC status of all pending cases on a weekly basis.
- ~ Area to begin closing out all cases that have not resulted in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney.

The above recommendations will be implemented by June 15, 2009.

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER SSIGNATURE	DATE CARRE
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Do not concur	REVIEWERS SIGNATURE	DATE /7/09

INSPECTION PROGRAM CHAPTER 8

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command: Division: Contra Costa Golden Gate		Number: 320
Evaluated by: Lt. Shon Harris	valuated by:	
Assisted by: Sgt. Braden M	offett	Date: 06/03/2009

with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Followup Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION Command Level □ Division Level Office of Inspections □ Voluntary Self-Inspection Commander's Signature: Follow-up Required: ☐ Follow-Up Inspection ☐ Yes No BY: For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Does the command have sufficient procedures to Remarks: ensure that a CHP 735, Incident Response X Yes ☐ No □ N/A Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria? What are these procedures? CHP 735 procedures are explained in Area SOP. Expectations are reinforced followed-up on as necessary by, Area sergeants, Area court officer, and/or the front desk officer (designated as the Area CHP 735 coordinator). Does the command have a specific employee(s) Remarks: Front desk officer. N/A assigned to process all CHP 735 forms? Yes ☐ No If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is Remarks: Area SOP □ N/A the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms Yes ☐ No listed in their job description or any other document?

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies

INSPECTION PROGRAM

	 Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form? 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: All of the CHP 735's that were inspected were submitted to FMS with the required criteria.
	 Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There Is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal) 	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: The command is utilizing the CHP 735A to track all DUI arrests that require a CHP 735. For cases pending blood results or conviction status, the front desk officer access the Contra Costa County computer network on a monthly basis and updates any pending cases as appropriate.
	 Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver 	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: None of Areas CHP 735s or CHP 735A entries had a notation indicating the date on which a completed CHP 735 was sent to FMS. Per FMS, Areas turn around time is 21 days.
8	 Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained 	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: See above.
9.	Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10). If the person arrested is translent, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No transient arrests were noted.
11	. Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: No CHP 415s indicated a total amount of billable time in the notes section.
14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene investigation Follow-up investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: The Adobe Forms program automatically enters the current hourly rate.
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
18. Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: The area is currently using the CHP735A to track all qualifying cases involving a CHP 735.
19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command tr	acking the	DUI Cost I	Recovery	Program?
20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information FMS Information RAC test results	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area uses the CHP 735A for this purpose. However the date that completed CHP 735s are sent to FMS has not been noted.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

n	Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 nonths after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Cases remain in suspense Indefinitely.
a F	Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to MS as well as the reason the case was closed and ate of last follow-up check?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: See above.
e	Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of rroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being rocessed by the Department?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: If necessary. However Area had not been notified of any overpayments.
by ar su	s the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent y FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms nd case status identifying any deficiencies in the ubmission and accountability of the DUI Cost ecovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				
co	FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for ompleteness of information and returning deficient orms to the issuing command for corrections?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Contra Costa	Golden Gate	8	
Inspected by:	tac	Date: 06/03/09	

Page 1 of 2	· ·	l Jen	nifer Manlutac	06/03/09	
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, con	Inspections Inspections	on number. Under "Forw of shall be utilized to do	vard to:" enter the nex cument innovative pr	it level of command where the actices, suggestions for state	ewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command L Executive Office Level	.evel	Total hours expende inspection:	d on the	☐ Corrective Action Pla	
Follow-up Required: ☑ Yes ☐ No	Forwar Due Da				
Chapter Inspection:					
Inspector's Comments Regar	ding In	novative Practice	S:	201.00	
Command Suggestions for St	atewid	e Improvement:			
Inspector's Findings:				0000	inopostod
Ten of the Area's 24 Reimburs The inspection was conducted Golden Gate Division. Officer information, supplemental doc	by SS Kyle P	A Jennifer Manlut acheco of the Cor	ac. She was as ntra Costa Area	sisted by SSA Jeri Ti was available to prov	ison from
The inspection team found tha motion, or ordinance of the loc other local public body.	t Area al gove	has not traditional erning body when	ly obtained a co contracting part	py of the resolution, eity, c	order, Jistrict, or
Additionally, Area has not attached a CHP 312, Safety Services Program Task Order, and/or a CHP 313, Safety Services Program Daily Report to the CHP 467 when the package is sent to Fiscal Management Section (per HPM 11.1, Chapter 6).					
All other elements on which the	e inspe	ction focused wer	e in order and i	n compliance with po	licy.
Commander's Response:	Concu	r or 🗌 Do Not Cor	ncur (Do Not Cond	ur shall document basis	for response)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

上八〇		HONO	DOCOM
-	_		

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Contra Costa	Golden Gate	8	
Inspected by:		Date:	
Jennifer Manlu	tac	06/03/09	

Inspector's Comments:	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
etc.)	

Required Action	and the same of	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		

Area will begin obtaining a copy of the resolution, order, motion or ordinance of the local governing body when contracting with a county, city, district, or other local public body to comply with policy.

CHP 312 and CHP 313 will be attached to CHP 467 and sent to Fiscal Management Section.

Area plans to have the corrective actions in place by June 15, 2009.

	21 27 mil	
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE G. F. F.
in the second se	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	8/17/09

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
INSPECTION PROGRAM
CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command:	Division:	Number:		
Contra Costa	Golden Gate	320		
Evaluated by: Jennifer Manlutac		Date: 06/03/09		
Assisted by:		Date:		
Officer Kyle Pacheco		06/03/09		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ctor's Signat	иге;	
☐ Division Level	Command Level		Joseph S	, O	d.
☐ Office of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	1.	* 8		The second secon
Follow-up Required: Yes No	Follow-Up Inspection BY:	Commander's Signature: Date:			
For applicable policies, refe	r to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.				
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is	checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for e	xplanation).
	ce of services, is the ned of the rates charged for equipment usage, and	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 Does the billing rate in expenses such as unife 	clude mileage and other orm or equipment damage?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
agency, is the agency's obtained?		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 Is the billing code docu Services Billing Memor 	mented on the Reimbursable andum?	⊠ Yes	□ No	│ │	Remarks:
assigned to the detail if	n CHP uniformed employee the cancellation notification is to the scheduled service?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Is a minimum payment when employee(s) could cancellation of their ser		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
 Is information regarding necessary right-of-way 	the procedures to obtain clearances or permits, local r pertinent information made	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	specific services directed to	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
Are traffic control service approved by Division?			□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are traffic control service more approved by the Control of t	es estimated to be \$50,000 or Office of the Commissioner?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Do not have a contract in place
 Are extraordinary protection Assistant Commissione 	ctive services approved by the r, Field?	☐Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No extraordinary protective services contracts

INSPECTION PROGRAM

Ques	tions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance dep	oosits.			
	2. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16	Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Quest	ions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agre	ements.	e e		
	. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20.	Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: All matched
23.	Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25.	Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
26.	Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
	If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Never had contract over \$50,000
28.	Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Have never kept a copy; will start keeping copies with the contract.
29.	Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	⊠ Yes	ΠNo	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Do not keep CHP 312; will start keeping CHP 312
31. When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
Questions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pr	ocedures a	ind reporti	ng for se	rvices provided.
32. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No training contact in place
33. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
34. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
35. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
36. Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-malled to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
37. Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
38. Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protecti special projects:	ve services	and repo	rt of over	time hours for reimbursable
39. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No extraordinary protective services contract in place
40. Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
41. Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
42. Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:
43. Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
44. Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
45. Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	57.7		□ N/A	Remarks:
46. Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division		☐ No	L IN/A	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

47. Are all CC Division b	DZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to y the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
48. Are all CC Division a month?	DZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by nd forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime when there are reimbursable nonuniformed hours?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No nonuniformed reimbursable services overtime
prior to the	ndment of service agreement requested of fund being depleted, and if necessary, is of discontinued?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
51. Are all pay	ments made directly to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	command require delinquent companies to nding invoices in full prior to providing any rices?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

Memorandum

Date:

September 16, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Napa Area

File No.:

325.12135

Subject:

COMMAND INSPECTION - REIMBURSABLE SERVICES AND DUI COST

RECOVERY

The Napa Area concurs with the findings of the recent Command inspection conducted by Golden Gate Division. The inspection focused on Reimbursable Services and DUI Cost Recovery and confirmed that the Napa Area was in compliance with departmental policy and procedure regarding these programs.

M. A. RASMUSSEN, Captain

Commander

Memorandum

Date:

June 19, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Golden Gate Division

File No.:

365.14402

Subject:

CHAPTER 8 INSPECTIONS - NAPA AREA

On May 21, 2009, Golden Gate Division Inspection Team #3; Lieutenant Shon Harris, Sergeant Braden Moffett, and Staff Services Analyst Jennifer Manlutac inspected Napa Area's in-house DUI cost recovery and Reimbursable Services Agreement procedures. The inspection team was assisted by Lieutenant Mike Berger and Officer Lisa Paulson of the Napa Area.

The inspection team reviewed 12 of the 120 CHP 735s generated in the Napa Area during the previous 12 months. Area has very thorough procedures in place to ensure the proper generation and processing of CHP 735s. Area uses the CHP 735A to its full extent which ensures compliance with policy relating to tracking, follow-up, and submission of all CHP 735 forms. Area SOP is fully updated to include detailed explanation of policy and flow charts that visually explain each person's role in the processing of the CHP 735.

Napa Area's procedures were very efficient and the inspection team has no recommendations for modification or changes to the Area's current policy. In fact, Napa Area could serve as a "best practices" example relating to processing the CHP 735.

Area processed 46 Reimbursable Services Agreements during the previous 12 months. The inspection team randomly reviewed 10 of the contracts and quickly discovered that Area is in total compliance with policy. The only exception was that a CHP 466, Reimbursable Services Control Log, has not been forwarded to Division as required by policy. This was immediately addressed by the Area Commander.

Napa Area has very thorough, productive, and efficient employees assigned to process the CHP 735 and Reimbursable Service Agreements and it clearly shows.

Shon L. Harris

James 1440z

Lieutenant

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Napa Area	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter: 8
Inspected by:	Date:	
Jennifer Manl	05/21/09	

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, con	Inspecti docume	on number. Under "Fon ent shall be utilized to do	ward to:" enter the nex cument innovative pra			
TYPE OF INSPECTION		Total hours expended on the		Corrective Action Plan Included		
☑ Division Level ☐ Command L	.evel	inspection:				
Executive Office Level		8		Attachments Included		
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:				
☐ Yes	Due D	ate:				
Chapter Inspection:						
Inspector's Comments Regard	dina Ir	novative Practice	s:			
Command Suggestions for St	atewid	le Improvement:				
				ā		
Inspector's Findings:						
Ten of the Area's 46 reimbursable service contracts were inspected. Napa Area is very efficient and imely with processing reimbursable services contract paperwork with the exception that a copy of the CHP 466, Reimbursable Services Control Log, has not been mailed or emailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month. This procedure was implemented in February 2009.						
Commander's Response: 🖂 Concur or 🗌 Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)						

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Napa Area	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter: 8		
Inspected by: Jennifer Manlutac		Date: 05/21/09		

Page 2 of 2

Inspector's Comments: etc.)	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
None.	
: Required Action	
Required Action	
Corrective Action Plan/T	Cara (11) (1)

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	5-21-09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	S-21 09
☐ Reviewer discussed this report with employee ☐ Concur ☐ Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	9/30/09

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command: Division: Golden Gate		Number: 325		
Evaluated by: Jennifer Manlutac		Date: 05/21/09		
Assisted by: Officer Lisa Paulson		Date: 05/21/09		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF	INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signatu	ire:			
	vision Level [Command Level		<i>(</i>)	1			
☐ Of	fice of Inspections	Thon Harris						
_	ollow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☐ No	Follow-Up Inspection	Commande	er's Signature	m		Date: 5-21-09	
For a	pplicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.						
Note:	If a "No" or "N/A" box is che	cked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	planation	PERMIT		
1.		f services, is the of the rates charged for	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	Ē	
2.			⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	TOTAL TO THE PROPERTY OF THE P	
3.	When a safety service is p agency, is the agency's fiv obtained?		☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No other state agency contract		
Is the billing code documented on the Reimbursable Services Billing Memorandum?			☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No contract required DGS billing code		
5.	Is \$50 charged for each Classigned to the detail if the less than 24 hours prior to	e cancellation notification is	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	*	
6.	Is a minimum payment of a when employee(s) could n cancellation of their service	ot be notified of the	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
7.	Is information regarding the necessary right-of-way clear requirements, and other per available to inquiring parties	e procedures to obtain arances or permits, local ertinent information made	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	·	
8.	Are written requests for spethe appropriate command?	ecific services directed to	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: W	hen necessary	
9.	Are traffic control services approved by Division?		⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
10.	Are traffic control services more approved by the Offic		⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
11.	Are extraordinary protective Assistant Commissioner, F	e services approved by the	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A		o extraordinary	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Quest	tions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance dep	osits.			
12	Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16	. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Quest	ions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agre	ements.			
18	. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20.	Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The numbers all matched
23.	Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25.	Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
26.	Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
27.	If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
28.	Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
29.	Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No statewide contract
31. When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
Questions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pro	ocedures a	and reporti	ng for se	rvices provided.
32. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No training contracts in place
33. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
34. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
35. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
36. Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area has not submitted a RS Control log to Division.
37. Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
38. Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No outstanding items
Questions 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protective special projects.	e services	s and repo	rt of over	time hours for reimbursable
39. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No extraordinary protective services contract
40. Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
41. Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
42. Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43. Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
44. Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
45. Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
46. Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

			Water Committee of the	
47. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
48. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
49. Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable nonuniformed overtime
50. Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Never had to deal with an amendment of service agreeement
51. Are all payments made directly to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Checks payable to CHP
52. Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	y Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area would not know if a company is delinquent.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Napa	Golden Gate	8	
Inspected by: Lt. Shon Harri	s	Date: 05/21/09	

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, continued to the continued of the co	Inspecti docume	on number. Under "Forvent shall be utilized to do	vard to:" enter the ne cument innovative pr	fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter ext level of command where the document ractices, suggestions for statewide e used if additional space is required.		
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command L Executive Office Level	Total hours expended on the inspection:		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included			
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☑ No	rd to: ate:					
Chapter Inspection:						
arrest report. This prompts the tracking process. The comple that no more billable time is ex	e clerion ted Ch pecteon arded t	cal staff to make and the stacked on the case. Ead of the clerical staff	n entry in the Cl to the final drat th CHP 735 is r for processing.	ft of the collision report indicating reviewed by the shift sergeant and This practice is very efficient and		
Command Suggestions for St	atewic	le Improvement:				
Inspector's Findings:			/ III AII =	205in COD. The COD		
Napa Area is very efficient and has thoroughly documented the CHP 735 process in SOP. The SOP explains the necessary elements of a completed CHP 375 and includes flow charts to assist personnel nunderstanding the different variables involved (ie: processing forms based on Section A vs. Section Beriteria). The inspection revealed no problems with the processing of CHP 735s in the Napa Area.						
Commander's Response: 🗵	Concu	r or 🗌 Do Not Cor	ocur (Do Not Cond	cur shall document basis for response)		

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

	110113	DOCOMEIAI
Page 2	of 2	

Command: Napa	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:		
Inspected by: Lt. Shon Harris		Date: 05/21/09		

Inspector's Comments: etc.)	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
Required Action	
Corrective Action Plan/T None.	imeline

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 5-21-09
(See HPIVI 9.1, Chapter 8 for appear procedures.)	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	5.21.09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	9.30.09

Remarks:

□ N/A

☐ No

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command: Division: Golden Gate		Number: 325			
Evaluated by: Lt. Shon Ha	rris	Date: 05/21/09			
Assisted by: Sgt. Braden Moffett		Date: 05/21/09			

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Followup Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION □ Division Level Command Level ☐ Office of Inspections □ Voluntary Self-Inspection Date: Commander's Signature Follow-up Required: Follow-Up Inspection ⊠ No 5-21-09 Yes For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Does the command have sufficient procedures to Remarks: ensure that a CHP 735, Incident Response □ N/A X Yes □ No Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria? 2. What are these procedures? CHP. 735 procedures and expectations are thoroughly addressed in Area SOP (Section 4.18). The arresting officer generates a preliminary CHP 735 for every arrest. The preliminary copy prompts the CHP 735 clerk to make an entry on the CHP 735A. The completed CHP 735 is attached to the completed collision report and processed by clerical staff. All cases that have BAC results or a conviction pending are placed in suspense and followed-up on regularly. 3. Does the command have a specific employee(s) Remarks: □ N/A 🖾 Yes ☐ No assigned to process all CHP 735 forms?

⊠ Yes

If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is

the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms listed in their job description or any other document?

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

	 Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with o criteria in either Section A or Section B of the 		′es 🔲 N	N/A	Remarks:
	 6. Does the command have a suspense syste to facilitate notification of a conviction involved meeting the requirements of the Driving Undersolve (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? To involve cases where the following criteria as A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under Content (BAC) and A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug a refusal) 	ring cases der the This would oplies: 08% y test (i.e.,	'es □ n	No N/A	Remarks:
	 7. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the of Section A of the form being forwarded to within ten business days from one of the foll dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were The date of BAC results of =.04% were for a commercial driver 	FMS Sowing received	es 🔲 N	No N/A	Remarks:
	 8. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the of Section B of the form being forwarded to within ten business days from being notified conviction of California Vehicle Sections 231 23153, or greater offence as a result of one following? The person arrested refused to provide chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained 	FMS \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	es	lo □ N/A	Remarks:
	 Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CF completed as required in Highway Patrol Ma 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to incident? 	inual 🔲 Y d	es 🗌 N	lo N/A	Remarks:
	10. If the person arrested is transient, is the cas entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI C Recovery Program, without forwarding the C to FMS?	Cost Y CHP 735	es 🗆 N	lo 🖾 N/A	Remarks:
	11. Are staff hours involved in the incident recor the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	ded on	es 🔲 N	lo 🗆 N/A	Remarks:
	12. Do the total number of staff hours charged of CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 41 Field Record?		es 🗆 N	lo N/A	Remarks:
-			The second secon		

3 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: The rate is automatically entered by the Adobe computer program.
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
18. Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command tra	acking the	DUI Cost F	≀ecovery I	Program?
 20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information FMS Information BAC test results 	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

21.	Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Cases are placed in a "Long Term Suspense" file and . followed-up on weekly.
22.	Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
23.	Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has not experienced an overpayment situation
24.	Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questi	on 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.			A HA	
25.	Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Nimitz IF	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
Inspected by:	Date:	
It Shon Har	1 05/26/09	

Page 1 of 2			
number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This	Inspecti docum	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or on number. Under "Forward to:" enter the need to shall be utilized to document innovative paction plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be	ractices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION		Total hours expended on the inspection:	□ Corrective Action Plan Included
☐ Division Level ☐ Command L	_evel		Attachments Included
Executive Office Level		6	-
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:	
⊠ Yes □ No	Due D	ate:	
Chapter Inspection:			
Inspector's Comments Regar	ding l	an evetive Practices:	
Command Suggestions for St	atewic	le Improvement:	
Inspector's Findings:			
a year. Per Area SOP, all collis of CHP 735s, if applicable, wou	sions a uld be	erienced an incident requiring the are investigated by the host Area, handled by the CHP 735 clerk at all personnel to complete a CHF	Hayward Area.
recommended that the SOP be policy contained in HPM 11.1. since Area personnel would like personnel. The Area command	updat Specitely exp der wa	eed to include more detailed proce ic attention should be paid to propend billable time on a DUI collision of provided with a sample of recore	edures and/or specific reference to per and detailed CHP 415 entries on investigated by Hayward Area mmended SOP verbiage.
Commander's Response: ⟨∑ (Concu	or Do Not Concur (Do Not Conc	cur shall document basis for response)
1 2 0 - 1 2 0			in the complete of findings complete and
Inspector's Comments: Shall a	ddress	non concurrence by commander (e.g., f	indings revised, filidings unchanged,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Nimitz IF	Golden Gate	8	
Inspected by:		Date:	
Lt. Shon Harr	ris	05/26/09	

Required Action			0.25 - 44	THE REPORT OF	vii.	医克斯特斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯斯	
TO BE THE STATE OF THE SECOND OF THE SECOND SEC	Required Action						
	CONTRACTOR SERVICES	AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	。			water and the last of the last	Sign Designer
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	Corrective Action Pl	an/Timeline					

Area SOP will be updated immediately to incorporate the above recommendations.

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.' (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	Shuir L. Latimin	5-24-09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	5-26-09
☐ Reviewer discussed this report with employee ☐ Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command: Nimitz IF	Number: 347			
Evaluated by: Lt. Shon Harris	Date: 05/26/09			
Assisted by: Sgt. Braden Mo	Date: 05/26/09			

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE O	F INSPECTION		Lead Insp	ector's Signa	ture:		W. D. C.		
⊠D	ivision Level	Command Level	Show of large						
	ffice of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection		wh has	~~~ <u>\$</u>		22		
	ollow-up Required: ☑ Yes No	Follow-Up Inspection	On Commander's Signature: Date: 5-2						
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20.									
Note:	If a "No" or "N/A" box is cl	necked; the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation				
1.	Does the command hav ensure that a CHP 735, Reimbursement Stateme arrest that meets the cos	Incident Response ent, is prepared for each	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
2.	CHP, handles all collisio 2006. No DUI arrests m reported no DUI PCF co	e addressed in the Area SOP. ns that occur in the facility. 10 et the criteria which required o lisions from Nimitz Inspection	00% of DUI completion	arrests we of a CHP 7	re reviewe 35. Hayw	ed through th	ne beginning of		
3.	Does the command have assigned to process all C	a specific employee(s) HP 735 forms?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
4.	the responsibility of proce	3 of this checklist is yes, is essing all CHP 735 forms on or any other document?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A		rgeant's collateral assigned as required		

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

_		V24-1-0-1-0-12	terral de la companya		
	5. Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Host Area processes all CHP 735s
	 Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal) 	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by Hayward Area.
7.	 Area CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were received 	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by Hayward Area.
	 The date of BAC results of = .04% were received for a commercial driver 		\$		
8.	of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? ■ The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test ■ The arrest was for drugs only ■ A BAC of < .08% was obtained	□Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by Hayward Area.
9,	Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No cases reported. However, Area SOP will be updated to ensure compliance.
	If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
11.	Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reported cases.
	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reported cases.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

13 Does the Notes portion of the CUD ALE indicate the	1			
13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more	☐ Yes	s 📗 No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reported cases.
than one activity?				
14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the	- my	[Feet 1	N 11/0	Remarks: No reported cases.
Department for the following activities associated wit an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery	h 🗀 Yes	s No	⊠ N/A	Nemans. No reported cases.
included in the CHP 735?			1	
Response Time			1	V-7
On-Scene Investigation			1	
Follow-up Investigation			1	T.
Report Writing		1		
Vehicle Storage	1			1
Call Back	1		1	
Field Sobriety Testing	1	j.	1	1
Transportation				I
Booking				
Chemical Testing		Ĭ	1	(
Traffic Control				
15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants,		_		
lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for	Yes	☐ No	· ⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reported cases.
time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory		1		
tasks?				1
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out	 			
to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being		□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: when applicable. Hourly
used?			23	rate is automated in the Adobe
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the	 			Program.
command and filed?	│ □ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Maintained at host Area.
60 to the annual still : 0				
18. Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to				Remarks: Maintained at host Area.
track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks. Maintained at nost Area.
19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command tr	acking the	DIII Coot I	Page (any 1	Dro avors 2
Hayward CHP handles the processing of CHP 735s for	the Nimitz	Inspection	recovery i	nd maintains the CHD 735 los
		- mopcodor	r i acility a	nd maintains the one 755 log.
20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to				
track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Maintained at host Area.
Program including the following information in the	1			
monitoring system? Defendant Information			i	
 Violation Information 				
Court Information				
FMS Information	1			
BAC test results	1			
21. Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12		~		
months after submission to the District Attorney	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reported cases.
closed out after court verification of case status?	_ ,		Z3 (4//	
22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have				
a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reported cases
FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and		_	L	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

date of last follow-up check?				
23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reported cases.
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Host Area staff reviews quarterly reports when applicable.
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Handled by host Area when applicable.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Nimitz IF	(
Inspected by:	
Jennifer Manluta	aC.

Command:

Division:

Chapter: Golden Gate 8

Date: 05/26/09

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required. TYPE OF INSPECTION Corrective Action Plan Included Total hours expended on the inspection: □ Division Level □ Command Level ☐ Attachments Included ☐ Executive Office Level 3 Forward to: Follow-up Required: Due Date: ⋈ No ☐ Yes Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Inspector's Findings: Nimitz Inspection Facility does not have Reimbursable Services Contract. Nine 2008 COZEEP/MAZEEP reports were inspected, and one report for 2007 was inspected. There is no COZZEP/MAZEEP reported for 2009. Nimitz Inspection Facility is very efficient and timely in processing the COZEEP/MAZEEP reports. The procedures in processing the COZEEP/MAZEEP reports were in compliance with policy. Commander's Response: ☐ Concur or ☐ Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,

etc.)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Division:	Chapter:	
Golden Gate	8	
Inspected by: Jennifer Manlutac		
	Golden Gate	Golden Gate 8

		Notaria 1600-lea (mente mente de mante de la constante de la constante de la constante de la constante de la c
Required Action		
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		A THE CONTRACTOR STATES AND STATE
		93
None.		
×		
Employee would like to discuss this year of with	GOMMANDER'S ŞIGNAŞURE	DATE
 Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. 	Communication of plant love	1
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	gheur L. Latimers	5-26-09
	INSPECTION'S SIGNATURE	DATE
	Then Harris	5-26-09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
☐ Concur ☐ Do not concur		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command:	Division:	Number:	
Nimitz IF	Golden Gate	347	
Evaluated by: Jennifer Man	Date: 05/26/09		
Assisted by:		Date:	
Nieves Evangelista		05/26/09	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF IN	NSPECTION		Lead Insp	ector's Signat	ure:			
⊠ Divi:	sion Level	☐ Command Level	5	2m De	2000-			
☐ Offic	ce of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection					VI. (200-200-200-200-200-200-200-200-200-200	
1	llow-up Required: Yes ⊠ No	Follow-Up Inspection BY:	Commander's Signature: Date: 5-26-6			Date: 5-26-09		
For app	plicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.					*	
Note: If	a "No" or "N/A" box is che	ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation			
1.	Prior to the performance contracting party informed services, departmental ed cancellation policy?	of services, is the d of the rates charged for	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A		o reimbursable services his Area.	
2.	Does the billing rate inclu- expenses such as uniforn		Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks; No	reimbursable services	
;	When a safety service is pagency, is the agency's fire obtained?	re-digit billing code	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: N	Remarks: No reimbursable services	
	is the billing code docume Services Billing Memoran	nted on the Reimbursable	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services		
ā	s \$50 charged for each C assigned to the detail if the ess than 24 hours prior to	e cancellation notification is	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No	o reimbursable services	
٧	s a minimum payment of when employee(s) could r cancellation of their servic	ot be notified of the	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services		
7. la n re	s information regarding the necessary right-of-way cle equirements, and other payailable to inquiring partic	e procedures to obtain arances or permits, local ertinent information made	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No	o reimbursable services	
	Are written requests for sp he appropriate command		☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No	reimbursable services	
9. A	Are traffic control services approved by Division?	less than \$50,000	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No	reimbursable services	
10. A		estimated to be \$50,000 or ce of the Commissioner?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No	reimbursable services	
11. A		e services approved by the	□ Vas		⊠ N/A	Remarks: No	reimbursable services	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance d	eposits.			
12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	☐ Yes	. □ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
14. Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	│ ☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agr	eements.			
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
19. Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
21. Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
22. Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
29. Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
31. When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	
Questions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pr		and report	ing for se	ervices provided.
32. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
33. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
34. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
35. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
36. Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
37. Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
38. Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
Questions 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protective special projects.	e services	and repo	rt of over	time hours for reimbursable
39. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services.
40. Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
41. Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
42. Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
43. Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
44. Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
45. Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
46. Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	□ Yes		⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

47. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
48. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
49. Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
50. Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
51. Are all payments made directly to FMS?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services
52. Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable services

Memorandum

Date:

June 10, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Golden Gate Division

File No.:

365.14402

Subject:

CHAPTER 8 INSPECTIONS - SAN FRANCISCO AREA

On May 27, 2009, Golden Gate Division Inspection Team #3; Lt. Shon Harris, Sgt. Braden Moffett, and SSA Jennifer Manlutac inspected San Francisco Area's in-house DUI cost recovery and Reimbursable Services Agreement procedures. The inspection team was assisted by San Francisco Lt. Dane Lobb, Officer Sue Farrell, Officer Tony Tam, and Officer Michael Sheets.

The inspection team reviewed a random sample consisting of ten percent of Area's CHP 735s from the previous 12 months and subsequently made the following findings:

Area processing CHP 735s was inconsistent and unreliable until approximately 3 months before the inspections. At that time, Lt. Lobb conducted a self-inspection and began to remedy the problems he observed. Prior to Lt. Lobb's inspection, Area did not have a system in place to ensure that a CHP 735 was initiated. All cases in which one was submitted were processed, but not necessarily within the required time constraints. Area did not have a tracking system in place other than a file that contained all submitted/pending CHP 735s.

The inspection determined that CHP 415s associated with a CHP 735 did not have the defendant's name and the case number indicated on each billable line entry. Additionally, the total billable time was not indicated in the notes section of the CHP 415s. Accordingly, Area SOP needs to be further updated to provide specific direction relating to CHP 415 entries.

The Area Commander and Administrative Lieutenant have worked together to develop a plan to remedy all discrepancies in policy and procedure. Area has provided CHP 735 training to all sergeants, is now consistently utilizing the CHP 735A, Area SOP relating to DUI Cost Recovery is in the process of being updated to include more specific instructions and expectations, Area plans to review the CHP 735 process in detail at an upcoming training day, and Area has assigned an individual to begin a review of all DUI cases under one year old to confirm that a CHP 735 was prepared, if applicable, and if not, to address the possibility of initiating the cost recovery process.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 June 10, 2009

Ten of San Francisco Area's 42 Reimbursable Services Agreements were reviewed. Area has an effective system in place to ensure all RSAs are processed in a timely fashion and in compliance with policy. Area had one traffic control request that totaled more than \$50,000. For an unknown reason, there was a delay in obtaining written approval from the Office of the Commissioner. However, after several attempts to obtain approval, Area proceeded with the detail to avoid adversely affecting allied agencies and private businesses who had a large amount of resources already devoted to the event.

All exceptions noted in the inspection are in the process of being remedied by the FOO and Area Commander. It is expected that corrective measures will be in place by July 31, 2009.

Shon L. Harris Lieutenant

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter
San Francisco	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:	Date:	
Lt. Shon Harris		05/29/09

Page 1 of 2

1 490 1 01 2		ili.		enter de esperante esperante de la compansión de la compa
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, con	Inspection docume	Check appropriate boxe on number. Under "Forwant shall be utilized to doc	s as necessary, or fil ard to:" enter the nex ument innovative pra	I in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter it level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level	evel	Total hours expended on the inspection:		 ☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included .
Executive Office Level		16		
Follow-up Required:	Forwa			200 200 200 PEACE
⊠Yes □ No	Due D	ate:		
Chapter Inspection:				
Inspector's Comments Regard	ding Ir	inovative Practices		
Command Suggestions for St	atewic	le Improvement:		The second secon
i ann ainmeann a 1997 — maraid ainmean ainmean ann an Airmean ann an ann ann ann an an an 1980 ann an 1980 ann			No. Market and American and American Special S	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		anne program in the annex comment is the contract of the contr
cases that meet the criteri	a for o of the iple bi	cost recovery have defendant or case llable activities wer	been overlooke number and the	As such it is quite possible that ed. Several CHP 415 line entries total billable time was not noted in one CHP 415 line entry but
together to develop a plan provided CHP 735 training SOP relating to DUI Cost instructions and expectation training day, and Area has	to reigeto all Recovers, A Sassig 735 w	nedy all of the abo sergeants. Addition rery is in the procest rea plans to review Ined an individual to as prepared, if app	ve observations on ally, Area is ress of being update the CHP 735 perior begin a revieur	nistrative Lieutenant have worked s. On May 6, 2009, Area now utilizing the CHP 735A, Area ated to include more specific process in detail at an upcoming w of all DUI cases under one year not, to address the possibility of
Commander's Response: ⊠ 0	Concu	r or □ Do Not Con	cur (Do Not Conc	ur shall document basis for response)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

	A STATE OF THE PERSON OF THE P	THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER.
Command:	Division.	Chapter.
San Francisco	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:	Date	
Lt. Shon Harris		05/29/09

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)
Required Action
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline
Confective / Cotton 1 Idn/ 1 informed
Area has begun all necessary corrective action and plans to have all measures in place by July 31,
2009. ACHIEF LEONARD HAS REQUESTED THE COMMANDERS -MCCHIEF LEONARD HAS REQUESTED THE COMMANDERS -MCCHIEF LEONARD HAS REQUESTED THE COMMANDERS
Notes (50 NAM) HAS REQUESTED THE
AJUAN PLAN 189 8.20.07
-need 102

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	5/29/07	
(Gee Till M. O. T. Chiapter of the appearance	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE 5-19.09	
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	8.7-09	

before the detail began

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command: San Francisco	Division Golden Gate	Number 335
Evaluated by: Jennifer Manlutac		Date: 05/27/09
Assisted by: Officer Sue Farrell		Date: 05/27/09

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION Command Level □ Division Level Voluntary Self-Inspection Office of Inspections Commander's Signature Follow-up Required: Follow-Up Inspection 5/29/09 X No Yes For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation 1. Prior to the performance of services, is the Remarks □ N/A □ No X Yes contracting party informed of the rates charged for services, departmental equipment usage, and cancellation policy? Does the billing rate include mileage and other Remarks: No □ N/A Yes expenses such as uniform or equipment damage? When a safety service is provided to another state Remarks: □ No □ N/A agency, is the agency's five-digit billing code obtained? Is the billing code documented on the Reimbursable Remarks: N/A X Yes No Services Billing Memorandum? Is \$50 charged for each CHP uniformed employee Remarks* □ N/A ⊠ Yes □ No assigned to the detail if the cancellation notification is less than 24 hours prior to the scheduled service? Is a minimum payment of 4 hours overtime charged Remarks: □ N/A ☐ No X Yes when employee(s) could not be notified of the cancellation of their service(s)? Is information regarding the procedures to obtain Remarks: M/A No Yes necessary right-of-way clearances or permits, local requirements, and other pertinent information made available to inquiring parties? 8. Are written requests for specific services directed to Remarks: N/A MO X Yes the appropriate command? Are traffic control services less than \$50,000 Remarks □ N/A X Yes □ No approved by Division? 10. Are traffic control services estimated to be \$50,000 or Remarks Area had one contract over ⊠ No [] N/A ☐ Yes more approved by the Office of the Commissioner? \$50,000 and sought approval multiple times without receiving a response

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Quest	tions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance dep	osits.			
12	Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16	Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Will be working towards compliance with policy
Quest	ions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agre	ements.			
18.	Is a CHP 466 maintained?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19.	Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20.	Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The numbers all matched.
23.	Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Copies of CHP 465 are filed at Area per previous policy.
24.	Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
	Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: When necessary
27.	If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
28.	Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Newly implemented

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

70	Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		NET 1 1774 177
20	ordinance of the local governing body obtained when	Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks
	one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district,	K			
	or other local public body?				
29	Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office				Pamadus .
20.	of Dignitary Protection?		□ No	N/A	Remarks.
30	Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467		Circuit as No.		Remarks.
1	forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
1	effect?				
31	When state agencies are requesting a statewide		515055	April 10000000	Remarks
"	agreement, are they referred to Enforcement		☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks
	Services Division Field Support Section?	200000000000000000000000000000000000000			
Questi	ons 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pro	cedures a	nd reporti	ng for se	rvices provided.
-24 3				r	
32.	Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when	☐ Yes	☐ No	N/A	Remarks: Area does not process
	fees are collected on the day of the training session?	[_] 1 G2	[_] [40	EN 141.1	training requests.
33.	Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement	And a control of the			Remarks
	submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon	⊠ Yes	☐ No	N/A	110,110,110
1	completion of services (other than COZEEP,				
	MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and				
	special projects) within 5 days?				
34.	Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next	5711	CT No.	□ N/A	Remarks
	level of review?		No_	LINA	
35.	Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to	571	LINE	□ N/A	Remarks:
	FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control		☐ No	I I IVIM	
	Log?				
36.	Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services	N Vac	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division	☐ Yes		LINA	
	Coordinator at the end of each month?				
37.	Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified	1571 Van	□No	□ N/A	Remarks ¹
	with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure	☐ Yes	□ 140	[-] (41.)	
	all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for				
	billing purposes?	·	**************		***************************************
38.	Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks. Area does not have any
			· —		outstanding items
Questi	ons 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protectiv	e services	s and repo	ort or ove	Thine floure for remindreanie
specia	projects.	·	1		
39.	Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to	CT 32-2	C) Nia	⊠ N/A	Remarks. Area does not process
	FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective	Yes	☐ No	MINI	extraordinary protective services
	services?				
40.	Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on	N Vac	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
	every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	L 110	1-110	
41.	Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special	⊠ Yes	□ No	N/A	Remarks:
	project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each	[] IES		Lines	YALDAS COMMINSTERNIA COMMINSTE
	special project?	·			
42.	Are the special project codes on the overtime	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
	report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project	(7) 103	L 1110		
	code has been used?	 			
43.	Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	IXI Yes	П No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8 COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

	Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
45.	Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
46.	Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks.
47.	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
49.	Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No reimbursable nonuniformed overtime
50.	Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has never encountered this situation
51.	Are all payments made directly to FMS?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
52.	Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area would not know if a company is delinquent

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

1 490 1 01 -	Page	1	of	3
--------------	------	---	----	---

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
San Francisco	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:	ac	Date: 05/28/09

Page 1 of 3			refresence de mante, eque e	ing the state of t
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter I shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, corr	Inspection	on number. Under Forwar	ment innovative ora	I in the blanks as indicated Enter the chapter it level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide used if additional space is required.
TYPE OF INSPECTION ☑ Division Level ☐ Command Le ☐ Executive Office Level	evel	Total hours expended inspection:	on the	Corrective Action Plan Included Attachments Included
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☑ No	Forwa			
Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regard	ding l	nnovative Practices:		
Command Suggestions for St	atewi	de Improvement:		
inspected. Area's overting	the 30	ordinator also coordi Aministrative lieuteni	nates all reimb ant and is subt	en May 2008 and May 2009 were bursable services contracts. She ported by a well-trained clerical
a single technical exception	on. ssed a	request for traffic c	ontrol services	order and prepared per policy with
more than \$50,000. Area Commissioner as require made to go ahead with the other support personnel v	subn d, but e deta vho w	nitted multiple reque did not receive a re ail due to the extens ere in place and pre	ests for approve sponse before ive number of epared to proce	at to the Office of the the deadline. The decision was allied agencies, resources, and eed.
Commander's Response: ঢ	Conc	ur or □ Do Not Con	cur (Do Not Con	cur shall document basis for response

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

P	а	g	е	2	of	3

Command: San Francisco	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter 8
Inspected by: Jennifer Manlutac		Date: 05/28/09

Inspector's Comments:	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
etc.)	

Required Action	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	5 /29/09	
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE HOW LOWIN	5-29-09	
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	8.7-69	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command: Division: San Francisco Golden Gate		Chapter 8		
Inspected by: Jennifer Manlutac		Date. 05/28/09		

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command:	Division:	Number:		
San Francisco	Golden Gate	335		
Evaluated by: Lt. Shon Harris		Date: 05/29/09		
Assisted by:		Date		
Sgt. Braden Moffitt		05/29/09		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Followup Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected Lead Inspector's Signature TYPE OF INSPECTION Command Level Division Level Office of Inspections ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Commander's Signature. Follow-up Required: Follow-Up Inspection □ No X Yes Parl -Ct 5/29/09 For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Does the command have sufficient procedures to Remarks: □ N/A ensure that a CHP 735, Incident Response X Yes No Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria? What are these procedures? The preparation of a CHP 735 has been inconsistent historically. Particularly in cases not involving a collision (ie: क्ष "Be On the Lookout" broadcast). If one of the Area court officers observed that a CHP 735 was not attached to a DUI report, he requested a completed form from the arresting officer and/or the arresting officer's supervisor. However no further follow-up was conducted. However, Area has recently began to put extensive corrective measures in place to include revision of the Area SQP. training road patrol officers, sergeants, court officers, and clerical staff. As of approximately 04/15/09, area sergeants require a CHP 735 be attached to all applicable DUI arrest reports without exception. The applicable court officer then makes an entry into the CHP 735A log which creates an efficient and effective tracking/suspense system Timely follow-up is conducted as needed (BAC results and/or conviction status). 3. Does the command have a specific employee(s) Remarks. Two court officers and one □ N/A X Yes No assigned to process all CHP 735 forms? non-uniformed employee If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is Remarks Area SOP X Yes No N/A the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms listed in their job description or any other document?

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8 COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

5.	Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks;
6.	Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal)	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
7.	 Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver 	⊠ Yes	∏ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
8.	Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
9.	Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
	Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12.	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

13	B. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Corrective action being taken.
14	Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
	. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	⊠ Yes	[] No	□ N/A	Remarks.
16.	Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
18.	Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Historically used sporadically. Area has implemented effective corrective measures
	In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command tra	acking the	DUI Cost F	Recovery I	Program?
20.	Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information BAC test results	⊠ Yes	No	□ N/A	Remarks Area currently uses the CHP 735A to track pending cases

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

21. Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks. No cases currently on life meet this criteria
22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks.
23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks

Memorandum

Date:

June 26, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Golden Gate Division

File No.:

301.13154

Subject:

CHAPTER 8 INSPECTIONS – SAN JOSE AREA

On June 11, 2009 and June 19, 2009, Golden Gate Division Inspection Team #1; Lieutenant Dane Lobb, Sergeant Jim Libby and AGPA Tina Cook, conducted a Division level inspection. The inspection team utilized the guidelines found in Chapter 8 of HPM 22.1, for this inspection. Furthermore, the team used a CHP form 680U for the inspection. The goal of the inspection was to determine the level of compliance with CHP policy found in Chapter 6 of HPM 11.1, reimbursable services agreements (RSA's) and in Chapter 20 of HPM 11.1 the DUI cost recovery program. AGPA Cook inspected the records and procedures used by the San Jose Area for RSA's. Sergeant Libby reviewed the procedures and inspected the records for San Jose Area's DUI cost recovery program. The inspection team was assisted by San Jose Area personnel who provided requested records.

The inspection team reviewed a random sample consisting of ten percent of Area's CHP 735s from the previous 12 months and subsequently made the following findings:

This inspection found that Area had failed to forward nine of 33 cases to FMS within the required 10-day period. Area did not initially uses a CHP 735A to track cases but during the inspection process prepared and completed a 735A. The local Office of the District Attorney did not provide Area with the adjudication of cases in a timely manner making it difficult to determine the outcome of a qualifying case. The Area Administrative Sergeant oversees the 735 program and the management team provides oversight and review. All personnel involved in the tracking of these events have a clear understanding of policy, the process and the deadlines.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 June 26, 2009

30 Reimbursable Services Agreements were reviewed. Area has an effective system in place to ensure all RSAs are processed in a timely fashion and in compliance with policy. Minor errors were noted as outlined on the attached spreadsheet. Errors found during the inspection were typically data entry omissions. These errors did not have an impact on the processing of the agreements.

The discrepancies found during this inspection were reviewed and discussed with the Command. The Command has initiated appropriate corrective procedures to minimize a reoccurrence.

Dane Lobb Lieutenant

Attachments

Memorandum

Date:

August 11, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

San Jose Area

File No.:

340.11167.12719

Subject:

CHAPTER 8 EXCEPTIONS

As a result of the recent Chapter 8 inspection conducted by Golden Gate Division, the San Jose Area has instituted the following corrective action:

CHP 735 will be tracked via a CHP 735A form. The CHP 735A form will be cross-referenced with data obtained from the Area Information System to ensure completeness. The CHP 735A form and Area Information System will be reviewed periodically by Area management. The Area administrative sergeant will verify CHP 735 forms for completeness and accuracy when compared to submitted CHP A415 forms. Field sergeants and officers have received training at briefings and staff meetings regarding completion of CHP 735 forms.

The San Jose Area Reimbursable Services Coordinator and Supervisor are fully aware of the requirements of forwarding the reimbursable services log to Golden Gate Division as required by policy. The administrative sergeant has a "suspense" file in place to provide verification.

If you have further questions, please contact myself or Lieutenant Spencer Boyce at (408) 467-5400.

Thank you for your continuing support.

C. J. WAYNE, Captain

Commander

Safety, Service, and Security

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

	110110	DOODIVIL
Daga 1	of 2	

Pag	e 1	1 0	f	2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Santa Rosa	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:		Date:
J. Libby		06/10/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall I number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co	Inspecti docum	on number. Under "Forv ent shall be utilized to do	vard to:" enter the ne cument innovative p	fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter ext level of command where the document ractices, suggestions for statewide be used if additional space is required.		
TYPE OF INSPECTION	77 ABAG 2 3 B A F R P 3 C	Total hours expende	d on the	Corrective Action Plan Included		
☐ Division Level ☐ Command I	_evel	inspection:				
		8	a a			
☐ Executive Office Level				250		
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:	L 25 3 25 7 7			
	Due D	oto:	A Carrier			
☐ Yes 🖾 No	li	ale.	EAST NEW YORK			
Chapter Inspection:			N. C. W. State of the			
Inspector's Comments Regar	ding Ir	anovative Practices		and the state of the property of the party o		
The Lieutenant reviewing and				int billed on the CHP 735 if the		
time spent on the DUI investig			dado ino amoc			
The Santa Rosa Area will send			ers who have t	ransferred out, vet still need to		
submit either CHP 415's or Ch						
Command Suggestions for St						
			rsement for Ch	HP 735's. This amount would be a		
guideline and could be adjuste						
Currently, there is no AIS entry	which	allows for tracking	g of non-collision	on DUI arrests which meet the		
criteria for Cost Recovery.	HALL MINE			5.		
Inspector's Findings:						
				735's was conducted on June 10,		
2009. The inspection examine						
eam and court officer understa	and the	e proper procedure	s involved in th	ne processing of CHP 735's.		
Area utilizes a CHP 735A to ensure the proper and timely submission of CHP 735's.						
Area utilizes a CHP 735A to en	isure ti	ne proper and time	ely submission	01 CHF 735 S.		
10. There have been no reported arrests of transients.						
23. Area does not proces	•					
Commandaria Dassassas 57.0	`	r or Do Not O	our (Da Nat O	our shall desument hadis for reconstant		
Commander's Response: 🛛 Concur or 🗌 Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)						

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: San Jose	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:	
Inspected by: Jim Libby		Date: 06/19/2009	

Page 1 of 2

1 age 1 012						
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall I number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co	r Inspecti s docum	on number. Under "Forward to:" en ent shall be utilized to document inn	iter the nex novative pra	I in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapte it level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide used if additional space is required.		
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command !	Level	Total hours expended on the inspection:	40	Corrective Action Plan Included		
Executive Office Level		16		Attachments Included		
Follow-up Required:	Forwa					
☐ Yes ☑ No	Due D	ate:				
Chapter Inspection.						
Inspector's Comments Regar	ding Ir	novative Practices:				
Command Suggestions for St Currently, there is no AIS entry criteria for Cost Recovery.			-collisio	n DUI arrests which meet the		
Inspector's Findings:						
An Inspection of procedures by the San Jose Area for the completion and submission CHP 735's was conducted on June 19, 2009, and June 23, 2009. The inspection examined 33 of the 337 events which required the preparation of a CHP 735. The Area Management team, Administrative Sergeant and Clerical staff understand the proper procedures involved in the processing of CHP 735's.						
Prior to the June 19, 2009, inspection Area did not utilize the CHP 735A for tracking. Area initiated the use of the CHP 735A and has put necessary follow-up procedures into place to track CHP 735 submissions. Area has provided training via briefing items to officers, supervisors, and clerical staff on CHP 735 tracking and submission procedures. Management has follow up procedures in place to ensure the proper and timely submission of CHP 735's.						
 10. There have been no reported arrests of transients. 13. The billable DUI time is highlighted on the CHP 415. 14. Response time is not consistently included in the CHP 735. 19. The Area uses updated AIS printouts to track the DUI Cost Recovery Program. 23. Area does not process CHP 735 overpayments. 						
Commander's Response: ⊠ C	Concur	or Do Not Concur (Do N	Not Concu	ir shall document basis for response)		

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

	0	ع ـ	9	
~aae	Z	of	4	

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
San Jose	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:		Date:
Jim Libby		06/19/2009

<u> </u>		
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non etc.)	concurrence by commander (e.g., findi	ngs revised, findings unchanged,
79		
: Required Action None noted.		
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		
		2.
None required.		
		× .
		•
	, , , , ,	
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	7/30/09
(See 111 W. o. 1, Griapier o loi appear procedures.)	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	7/30/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command:	Division:	Number:		
San Jose	San Jose Golden Gate			
Evaluated by:	Date:			
Sergeant J. Li	06/19/2009			
Assisted by:	Date:			
Lieutenant D.	06/19/2009			

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TY	PE OF INSPECTION	102.00	Lead Insp	ector's Signal	lure:	
	Division Level	☐ Command Level			4	
	Office of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	/	75) 75)	1	
	Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes	Follow-Up Inspection	Comman	der's Signatur	e: UV	Date:
	or applicable policies, refer			<i>I</i> [7
No	ote: If a "No" or "N/A" box is c	hecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation	
	ensure that a CHP 735,	ent, is prepared for each st recovery criteria?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
COI	ch arrest report is accompani mpleted. The shift Sergeant r	ed by a tracking sheet which in eviews each arrest report to er tive Sergeant reviews the CHP	nsure each	report med	eting the c	cost recovery criteria has a CHP
	assigned to process all (CHP 735 forms?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
		essing all CHP 735 forms ion or any other document?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	criteria in either Section A	MS) properly with completed A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	to facilitate notification of meeting the requirements Influence (DUI) Cost Recinvolve cases where the f A Blood Alcohol Cont A chemical test is pos	overy Program? This would ollowing criteria applies: ent (BAC) under .08%	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: The Area Court Officer obtains either a court filing or rejection for prosecution, and forwards this information to the Administrative Sergeant.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

 7. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 8. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained 	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: There have been no reported arrests of transients.
Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	⊠Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks: The billable DUI time is highlighted on the CHP 415
14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

3 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

15 Ave the state to				
15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out		 	-	
to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks;
18. Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command t	racking the	DUI Cost	Recovery	Program?
The area uses updated AIS printouts to track the DUI Cost Re				
20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 Defendant Information 				
 Violation Information 				
Court Information				,
FMS Information				
BAC test results Are copies not resulting in a second in the secon				
21. Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area does not process CHP 735 overpayments.
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for	T		- 10 - 10 T	
completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

SAN JOSE AREA

Number of Records Inspected:	10			
Inspected Information	Yes	No	N/A	Remarks
Agency Billing Code included on CHP 467 for Safety Services to other state agencies.			10	remand
\$50 or 4 hour Cancellation			10	Only one record ravioused indicated agree! Let 1
claimed when appropriate.	1		9	Only one record reviewed indicated cancellation of details and the cancellation time was claimed as appropriate.
RSA Number present on Paperwork	10			was startled do appropriate.
CHP 465 Completed	10			Two of the records had the CHP and Contractor signatures on separate copies of the CHP 465, when they should both be on the same copy
Advance Deposit Obtained.	8	1	1	Two advance deposits were not obtained one of which was for a public agency, which was not required at the time of the detail (prior to new policy).
CHP 251 completed and mailed to contracting company	4	3	3	Three CHP 251 were not complete when they should have been. One of the 3 that were not applicable was when the check was sent to HQ instead of Area so no CHP 251 was completed.
CHP 467 completed and submitted to FMS	10			9
Copy of CHP 465 and, if applicable, CHP 169 attached to weekly transmittal	5	2	3	No record of advance deposit in the weekly transmittal for two of the advance deposit checks obtained.
Copy of resolution, order, motion or ordinance of local governing body obtained if contractor is county, city, district or other local public body.		1	9	Only one record inspected falls under this policy, but detail was done prior to the new policy changes of February 2009.
CHP 312 and CHP 313 completed for RSA with state agency			10	No records inspected fell under this policy, but Area is aware of this policy.
CHP 467 submitted within 5 days	10			All records inspected were submitted within 5 days of the end of the detail.
Original CHP 465 at Area		10		Copies only as per previous policy.
SPC obtained/used for every R- Number and Statewide Contract	10			

Permits obtained Other remarks:	2	6	2	Two of the records inspected had copies of permits, but the permit numbers were no indicated on the CHP 467.
R-Numbers on CHP 467s match numbers on log.	10			
commander and submitted by 10th to FMS			10	
Reconciliation reports used to reconcile SPCs other than 50, 63, and 633 for RSAs. Reports signed, dated by			10	Area does not currently work any RSAs under codes other than 50 or 63.

COZEEP/MAZEEP Records			T	
Inspected.	20			
Inspection Information	Yes	No	NI/A	Describe
SPC Used for OT	20	INO	N/A	Remarks
\$50 or 4 hour cancellation		-		
claimed when appropriate.	16		4	
Reconcilation report reconciled			1	
with 415s	20			
SPCs verified	20			
Corrections noted on Reconcilation Reports	20			
Reconciliation reports approved				
and dated by by Commander.	20			
Original forwarded to Division by 15th.	10	10		Half of the records inspected were signed and submitted to Division after the 15th of the month. This was most likely due to repeated extensions of cut-off for time keeping, which causes the reports to print later in the month than they should.

t t

13

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 1	of 2	
--------	------	--

Command: Division: San Jose Golden Gate		Chapter:,
Inspected by: Tina Cook		Date: 6/11/2009

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Total hours e	xpended on the	Corrective Action Plan Included	
☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level☐ Executive Office Level		inspection:		Attachments Included	
Follow-up Required:	Due Date:				
Chapter Inspection:			The second of the San San	ALTO TO THE SERVICE OF THE	
Inspector's Comments Reg	arding Ir	novative Pra	actices:		

Twenty of the Area's 42 reimbursable services contracts initiated between May 2008 and May 2009 were inspected.

Inspection checklist item 3 Is not applicable. No records reviewed fell under this policy. Area is aware of this requirement

Inspection checklist item 4 is not applicable. No records reviewed fell under this policy. Area is aware of this requirement

Inspection checklist item 7 Area indicates that contractors already know this information when they contact the Area.

Inspection checklist item 10 and 11 does not apply. Area is working on one at this time, but it has not been approved at the final level.

Inspection checklist item 15 Three CHP 251's were not completed when they should have been. One of the 3 which was not applicable was when the check was sent to HQ instead of Area and for that reason no CHP 251 was completed.

Inspection checklist item 17 No record of advance deposit in the weekly transmittal for two of the advance deposit checks obtained and one check was sent directly to HQ by the contractor. Inspection checklist items 25 and 26 are not applicable because there were not qualifying contracts.

Inspection checklist item 30 Is not applicable. No Statewide agreements used.

Inspection checklist item 31 is not applicable. No request have been made.

Inspection checklist item 32 Is not applicable. No training sessions conducted.

Inspection checklist item 36: Copy of log is not being sent to Division. This policy was just instituted in February 2009

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: San Jose	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
inspected by:	1 0011111111111111111111111111111111111	Date:
Tina Cook		6/11/2009

Page 2 of 2

Inspection checklist item 39 Is not Inspection checklist items 45-46 and COZEEP/MAZEEP. Inspection checklist item 47 Half because of repeated extensions of Inspection checklist items 48-50 and COZEEP/MAZEEP. Inspection checklist item 52 Area	of the reports were submitted late cut-off for timekeeping. Are not applicable No SPCs used	to Division, more than likely for RSAs other than 63, 50,
Commander's Response: Concur or	Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur sha	Il document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non cetc.)	oncurrence by commander (e.g., findings	revised, findings unchanged,
: Required Action		
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		
None required. ,		·
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 7/30/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	7/30/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 9/30/09

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command: Division: San Jose Golden Gate		Number: 340		
Evaluated by: Tina Cook, A	 GPA	Date: 6/11/09		
Assisted by:		Date:		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF	INSPECTION		Lead Insp	ector's Signat	ure: //		
⊠ Di	vision Level [Command Level		,) (-			
☐ Of	fice of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	1 Warsh				
F	ollow-up Required: ☐ Yes	Follow-Up Inspection	Commander's Signature:			Date:	
For a	pplicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.		7/" "	1,		
Note:	If a "No" or "N/A" box is che		shall be ut	tilized for e	xplanatior		
1.	Prior to the performance of contracting party informed services, departmental equancellation policy?	of the rates charged for	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
2.	expenses such as uniform	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
3.	When a safety service is p agency, is the agency's fiv obtained?	☐ Yes	-□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No records reviewed fell under this policy. Area is aware of this requirement.		
4.	4. Is the billing code documented on the Reimbursable Services Billing Memorandum?			□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No records reviewed fell under this policy. Area is aware of this requirement.	
5.	5. Is \$50 charged for each CHP uniformed employee assigned to the detail if the cancellation notification is less than 24 hours prior to the scheduled service?			□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
6.				□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
7.	Is information regarding the necessary right-of-way clear requirements, and other per available to inquiring partie	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area indicates that Contractors already know this information when they contact the Area.		
8.	Are written requests for spethe appropriate command?	ecific services directed to	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	Are traffic control services I approved by Division?	ess than \$50,000	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
10.	Are traffic control services emore approved by the Office		☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area is working on one at this time, but it has not been completed.	

2 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

11. Are extraordinary protective services approved by the Assistant Commissioner, Field?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Office 12 through 47 and the control of the control	a swite	San de de la compa	2.1. kg/20.0000000	
Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance de	posits.		2000	Committee of Carrier Inches
12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Three CHP 251s were not complete when they should have been. One of the 3 that were not applicable was when the check was sent to HQ instead of Area so no CHP 251 was completed
16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: No record of advance deposit in the weekly transmittal for two of the advance deposit checks obtained and one check was sent directly to HQ by the contractor.
Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agree	ements.			
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Only copies on file, as per previous policy.
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area proceeds with all RSA arrangements, but does not obtain copies of all required permits.
25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district or other local public body?		□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: One record inspected fell under this new policy, but the detail was done in the prior fiscal year before policy was effective. Area is aware of the requirement.
29. Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	e ⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No records inspected fell under this policy.
31. When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has not had any requests.
Questions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pr	ocedures a	and report	ing for se	rvices provided.
32. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
33. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
34. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
35. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
36. Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Copy of log is not being sent to Division. This policy was just instituted in February 2009.
37. Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
38. Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protective special projects.	e services	and repo	rt of over	time hours for reimbursable
39. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
40. Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
41. Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

42. Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43. Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
44. Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
45. Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
46. Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
47. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Half of the reports were submitted late to Division, more than likely because of repeated extensions of cut-off for timekeeping.
48. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
49. Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks;
50. Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
51. Are all payments made directly to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
52. Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area is not aware of delinquent companies.

AREA: 340

TOTAL RECORDS: 337

RECORDS EXAMINED: 33

3/5/2009	6/22/2009	0.18	Y	N	6/22/2009	Y	Y	
3/6/2009	6/22/2009	.12/.12	Y	N	3/6/2008	T Y	Ÿ	
5/3/2009	NO	Refusal	Υ	N		N	N	DA rejected
5/4/2009	5/27/2009	0.12	Υ	N	5/27/2009	Y	Y	D/ Trojcoled
5/7/2009	5/27/2009	0.10	Y	N	5/27/2009	Ý	Ÿ	
5/8/2009	5/19/2009	0.10	Y	N	5/19/2009	Y	Ý	
	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,							

AREA: 340

TOTAL RECORDS: 337

RECORDS EXAMINED: 33

	·						-		
1				ARREST					
			ADDEOT	FOR					
DATE OF	DATE 735	BAC/DRUG	ARREST	OTHER	D	CONVICTION		415	\$
ARREST	SUBMITTED	RESULTS	FOR DUI	EVENT	DATE BAC	DATE IF	ATTACHED	CORRECT	
5/14/2008	5/22/2008	0.22	7/C 17/N,	(BOL) Y/N	AVAILABLE	APPLICABLE	Y/N	Y/N	NOTES
6/8/2008	8/13/2008	0.13	Y		5/22/2008		Υ	Υ	
6/11/2008	NO			N	8/13/2008		Y	Υ	
7/25/2008	8/22/2008	0.06	Y	N			N	N	DA rejected
7/27/2008		0.14/.14	Y	N	7/25/2008		Υ	Υ	
	9/18/2008	Refusal	Y	N	9/18/2008		Y	Υ	
7/30/2008	8/14/2008	0.17	Y	N	8/14/2008		Y	Y	
7/30/2008	8/22/2008	0.28	Υ	N	8/22/2008	11/5/2015	Y	Υ	
8/2/2008	8/22/2008	Refusal	Υ	N	8/22/2008		Υ	Υ	PAS .19/.21
8/2/2008	NO	.06/.07	Υ	N			N	N	DA rejected
8/5/2008	NO	0.05	Υ	N			N	N	DA rejected
8/6/2008	8/15/2008	0.17	Υ	N	8/15/2008		Y	Υ	
11/22/2008	12/16/2008	0.08	Υ	N	12/16/2008		Y	Υ	
11/23/2008	12/16/2008	0.19	Υ	N	12/16/2008	L.,	Υ	Υ	
11/26/2008	12/16/2008	0.16	Υ	N	12/16/2008		Υ	Y	
11/27/2008	12/16/2008	.11/.12	Y	N	11/27/2008		Y	Y	
11/28/2008	12/16/2008	0.12	Y	N	12/16/2008		Υ	Y	
11/29/2008	12/16/2008	0.09	Υ	N	12/16/2008		Y	Y	
11/29/2008		Refusal	Υ	N			N	N	DA rejected
11/30/2008	6/22/2009	0.14	Υ	N	6/22/2009		Y	Y	
11/30/2008	12/18/2008	0.20	Y	N	12/18/2008		Y	Y	
2/21/2009	6/22/2009	0.11	Y	N	6/22/2009		Y	Y	i i
2/22/2009	6/22/2009	0.23	Y	N	6/22/2009		Y	Ý	1
2/22/2009	6/22/2009	0.15	Υ	N	6/22/2009	77	Y	Ÿ	
3/1/2009	6/22/2009	0.12	Y	N	6/22/2009		Y	Y	
3/1/2009	3/17/2009	0.21	Y	N	3/17/2009		Y	Y	
3/1/2009	4/15/2009	0.24	Y	N	4/15/2009		Y	Y	
3/2/2009	4/15/2009	0.13	Y	N	4/15/2009		Y	Y	

Memorandum

omic or camorina ,

Date:

May 26, 2009

To:

Hayward Area

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Hayward Area

File No .:

345.11329.13119

Subject:

HAYWARD AREA CHAPTER 8 INSPECTION

On May 19, 2009, I conducted an audit of the Hayward Area's Reimbursable Services and DUI

Cost Recovery programs. Minor procedural errors were noted in both programs. Area now has procedures in place to correct deficiencies and will continue to perform internal audits to improve the command's efficiency.

R.F. LEAL, Captain

Commander

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page	1	of	2	
	-			

Command: Hayward	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter: 8
Inspected by:	Date:	
Sergeant Jar	05/27/2009	

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, con	Inspection number. Under "Forvals document shall be utilized to do	vard to:" enter the ne cument innovative p					
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command L Executive Office Level	Total hours expende inspection:	d on the	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included				
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☑ No	Forward to: Due Date:						
Chapter Inspection:		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	The state of the s				
Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: Hayward Area has included a section on their Arrest Report Tracking Sheet which requires a sergeant verify the completion and submission of a CHP 735. The sergeant is required to initial and date the Arrest Report Tracking Sheet. Hayward uses an Excel spreadsheet to track their CHP 735's, color coding CHP 735's which are pending completion, correction, BAC results or conviction. This allows an "at a glance" review of incomplete CHP 735's.							
Command Suggestions for St	atewide Improvement:						
Inspector's Findings:							
Hayward Area has a verifiable method for tracking and processing CHP 735's. All personnel involved were knowledgeable regarding the Cost Recovery Program.							
Commander's Response:	Concur or 🗌 Do Not Cor	Cur (Do Not Cond	cur shall document basis for response)				
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)							

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:		
Hayward	8			
Inspected by:	Date:			
Sergeant Jar	05/27/2009			

EDECOMPOSITION OF THE PROPERTY		
Required Action Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		
None required.		
The state of the last and the same this same to the	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
 Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.) 	COMMUNICATIONS	DATE
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.) Reviewer discussed this report with		

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command:	Division:	Number:	
Hayward	Golden Gate	345	
Evaluated by:	Date:		
Sergeant K. I	May 19, 2009		
Assisted by:OSS1	Date:		
Office	May 19, 2009		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

The state of the s		l ead Inch	ector's Signal	IIIA.				
TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead mape	scioi s digital	idio.				
Division Level	Command Level	9	/ /	2, .				
Office of Inspections	Voluntary Self-Inspection							
Follow-up Required:	Follow-Up Inspection	Command	er's Signature	B: //	······································	Date		
☐ Yes ☐ No	BY:	1	TH	L		5/24/09		
For applicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.							
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is ched	ked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for e	xplanation	1.			
 Prior to the performance o contracting party informed services, departmental equ cancellation policy? 	of the rates charged for ipment usage, and	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
Does the billing rate includ expenses such as uniform	or equipment damage?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
 When a safety service is preached agency, is the agency's five obtained? 	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Ac	counting Section obtains on.			
Services Billing Memorand	Is the billing code documented on the Reimbursable Services Billing Memorandum?			□ N/A	Remarks:			
 Is \$50 charged for each Chassigned to the detail if the less than 24 hours prior to 	cancellation notification is	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
	Is a minimum payment of 4 hours overtime charged when employee(s) could not be notified of the			□ N/A	Remarks:	o overesti i se		
 Is information regarding the necessary right-of-way cleated requirements, and other peture available to inquiring parties 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks	-			
8. Are written requests for spe the appropriate command?	8. Are written requests for specific services directed to				Remarks:			
	9. Are traffic control services less than \$50,000			□ N/A	Remarks:			
Are traffic control services emore approved by the Office		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Nes Nes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Ha	s Not Occurred.		
11. Are extraordinary protective Assistant Commissioner, Fi	services approved by the	☐ Yes	ППо	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Ha	s Not Occurred.		

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance de	eposits.			
12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks;
Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agr	eements.		Video Video	
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks;
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred
1. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred
27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred
28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred
29. Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

20 A== OUD 040 f. OUD 040 f. LOUD 10=				
30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred
31. When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred
Questions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement p	rocedures	and report	ing for se	rvices provided.
32. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party wher fees are collected on the day of the training session?	\	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
33. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upor completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	\	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
34. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
35. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	∑ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
36. Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
37. Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
38. Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protecti special projects.	ve services	and repo	rt of over	time hours for reimbursable
39. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
40. Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
41. Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
42. Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43. Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
44. Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
45. Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
46. Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

47. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
48. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
49. Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
50. Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred
51. Are all payments made directly to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Forwarded from Area to FMS
52. Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred.

Memorandum

Date:

August 24, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Hayward Area

File No.:

345.14995.09-046

Subject:

2009 COMMAND INSPECTIONS, 2nd QUARTER -CHP 735 (DUI COST

RECOVERY) INSPECTION - CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

On May 27, 2009, a Division-level inspection for the preceding 12-month period was conducted of the CHP 735 (DUI Cost Recovery) files in the Hayward CHP Area. The inspector found that the Hayward Area has a verifiable method for tracking and processing CHP 735's and that all personnel involved were knowledgeable regarding the DUI Cost Recovery program. In response to that inspection, the Hayward Area has created this Corrective Action Plan.

HISTORY:

When the Hayward Area learned that the DUI Cost Recovery program would be inspected, a thorough self inspection was conducted using the checklist contained in Highway Patrol Manual (HPM) 22.1, chapter 8. Several issues were identified. The self inspection revealed the following:

- There was no tracking system in place for CHP 735 forms, however the optional CHP 735A form was being used.
- Fifteen (15) CHP 735 forms from the first quarter of 2009 were inspected. Four (4) CHP 735 forms were submitted in excess of the 10 business day period.
- There was no system in place to determine case dispositions for CHP 735 forms with blood alcohol contents under 0.08, refusals, drug-only arrests, etc.
- CHP 415 forms did not indicate "billable hours" in the notes section as required by policy.
- There was no Standard Operating Procedure in place for the completion of CHP 735 forms.

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN:

After identifying the issues, the following corrective action steps were taken:

Safety, Service, and Security

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT, OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Page 1	of	2
--------	----	---

Command:	Division:	Chapter		
Hayward	Golden Gate	8-DUI Cost		
		Recovery		
Inspected by: Serg	eant K. Briggs	Date:May 19, 2009		

Page 1 of 2			E)
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co	r Inspection number. Under "Fi s document shall be utilized to	orward to:" enter the ne document innovative o	fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter ext level of command where the document tractices, suggestions for statewide be used if additional space is required.
TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level ☐ Command ☐ ☐ Executive Office Level	Level Total hours expeninspection:	ded on the	□ Corrective Action Plan Included □ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forward to: Golden Gate Division Due Date:		
Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regar None	ding Innovative Practic		
Command Suggestions for St	tatewide Improvement:	U-let	
None			
Cost Recovery program was in the 15 cases involving a CHP is submitted in excess of the 10 b to FMS with current reimburser	ispected, covering the p 735, Incident Response pusiness day period. P ment rate, including CH	period of January Reimbursement roperly completed IP 415, recorded	d CHP 735 forms are forwarded
Commander's Response: 🔲 (Concur or ☐ Do Not Co	oncur (Do Not Conc	ur shall document basis for response)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Hayward	Golden Gate	8-DUI Cost
	31.03500 11	Recovery
Inspected by: Serg	eant K. Briggs	Date:May 19, 2009

	The section was a section with
Inspector's Comments:	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
etc.)	

Required Action Corrective Action Plan/Timeline

The following procedures have been implemented at the Hayward Area to address the CHP 735, Incident Response Reimbursement Statement, timely submission and processing:

- Quarterly briefing items discussing proper procedures and timely submission of CHP 735 form.
- Development of Hayward Area tracking sheet, which includes section covering CHP 735 form review and submission to clerical staff.
- Development of log, tracking DUI Cost Recovery. This includes AIS Report Number, Arrest Date, Chemical Test result Date, Reason CHP 735 is Missing, Date CHP 735 Received, Date CHP 735 Sent to FMS, and Defendant Name.
- Follow up of case adjudication by court officer on a weekly basis, which is forwarded to clerical staff.

	/	
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	S/24 07
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	MAY 20,2009
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNÁTÜRE	DATE

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command:	Division	Number:
Hayward	Golden Gate:	345
Evaluated by:		Date:
Sergeant K. Briggs, ID 13119		May 19, 2009
Assisted by:		Date:
Office Assistant E. Klobas, ID		May 19, 2009
A12869		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Insp	ector's Signa	ture:	
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level	0	/ ฏ		
☐ Office of Inspections ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	1 /25	1340	THU	
Follow-up Required:	Command	der's Signatur	e:	Date: 5 26/09
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20.				
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	n shall be u	tilized for e	xplanatior	4
Does the command have sufficient procedures to ensure that a CHP 735, Incident Response Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
2. What are these procedures? Per Hayward Area S.O.P., officers are required to submit income review submitted forms and initials Hayward Area tracking showhen CHP 735 submitted to clerical and supervisors initials are conducted regularly. The issue is also a topic at Area States	eet. Trackir nd date. Re	ng sheet co ecurring brid	ntains sec	ction for CHP 735, detailing
Does the command have a specific employee(s) assigned to process all CHP 735 forms?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: OA E, Klobas
4. If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms listed in their job description or any other document?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

1	Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
2	 Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal) 	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Court Officer receives weekly case disposition log from court. This is forwarded to clerical employee handling CHP 735 forms.
3.	 Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver 	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: For the first quarter of 2009, 15 CHP 735 forms were submitted to FMS. Four of these were submitted in excess of 10 business days. Area now has procedures in place to correct deficiency.
4.	of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Has Not Occurred.
5.	completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
6.	If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has not encountered.
7,	Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
8.	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

3 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

billa	s the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the ble DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more one activity?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Highlighted in Activity/Comments section.
2. Are Dep an in inclu	the staff hours incurred by members of the artment for the following activities associated with acident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery uded in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
lieuti time 12 o taski		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
to all		⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
comi	copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the mand and filed?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	e command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery ram?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
7. In the A log has been	e absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command train established to track the following: AIS Report Ng, Date CHP 735 Sent to	lumber, Ar	rest Date,	Chemical	
track Progr monif • C • V • C	ommands using a case monitoring system to cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery am including the following information in the coring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information MS Information AC test results	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area Information System

INSPECTION PROGRAM

9.	Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: The Area has developed a plan to address this issue.		
10	Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		
11	. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		
12	Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.							
13.	Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		

Memorandum

Date:

August 24, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Hayward Area

File No.:

345.14995.09-047

Subject:

REIMBURSABLE SERVICES AGREEMENT INSPECTION -

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

On June 26, 2009, a Division-level inspection for the preceding 12-month period was conducted of the Reimbursable Services Agreement files in the Hayward CHP Area. In response to that inspection, the Hayward Area has created this Corrective Action Plan.

HISTORY:

When the Hayward Area learned that the Reimbursable Services Agreement program would be inspected, a thorough self inspection was conducted using the checklist contained in Highway Patrol Manual (HPM) 22.1, Chapter 8. The self inspection was conducted by Sergeant Kevin Briggs, I.D. 13119. The self inspection revealed the following:

- The Hayward Area had twenty (20) reimbursable services agreements. 100% of the agreements were examined.
- Area did not maintain a CHP 466 Reimbursable Services Control Log log.
- There was a general lack of training and accountability for the paperwork transactions and thoroughness of completion of contract requirements.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE DIVISION-LEVEL INSPECTION:

- The Hayward Area had twenty (20) reimbursable services agreements. 100% of the agreements were examined.
- The state agency's billing code was not obtained or documented on the Reimbursable Services Billing Memorandum.
- One permit was referenced but there were no copies of any permits on file.
- Advance deposits are being collected, but not for all details prior to the start of the service.
- One of three advance deposit checks has a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company.

Safety, Service, and Security

Golden Gate Division Page 2 August 29, 2009

- One of three contracts with advance deposits had a copy of the contract attached to the weekly transmittal.
- Area does not maintain a CHP 466 log. This is due in part to the fact that there were no R-Numbers issued to the Area during this fiscal year.
- Only copies of Reimbursable Services Agreements are maintained at Area.
- Area does not ensure the needed permits are obtained before proceeding with Reimbursable Services Agreements.
- Area performed a safety services detail for another agency. The CHP 312 and CHP 313 were completed but the CHP 312 was not signed.
- Five of five contracts were not processed within five days because there was no Captain or Lieutenant assigned to Area for a 30 day period when these details were completed.
- Area does not maintain a Reimbursable Services Control Log.
- Area is not informed of delinquent companies.

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN:

- It is not possible to correct past errors on the reimbursable services agreements. OSS I Poornima Deo will ensure all policies and procedures are followed for future agreements.
- On-going training will be provided specific to each employee involved in the RSA program.
- Area will begin using the CHP 466 Reimbursable Services Control Log.
- Area has created a form to be provided to the requesting party that will indicate how to get the necessary permits, resolutions, etc.
- An Area checklist has been developed to ensure timely completion and submission of required documents.

SUMMARY:

The issues identified during the Division inspection will be addressed and Area will continue to take an active role in managing reimbursable services agreements.

C. J. SHERRY, Lieutenam

Acting Commander

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:		
Hayward	Golden Gate	8		
Inspected by:	Date:			
Tina Cook	5/26/2009			

Page 1 of 2

	:								
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required.									
TYPE OF INSPECTION		Total hours expended on the		Corrective Action Plan Included					
☑ Division Level ☐ Command L	inspection:		Soft Course Florida Florida Co						
☐ Executive Office Level		8		Attachments Included					
Fallow up Dogwined	Ird to:		1						
Follow-up Required:									
Yes No Due Da		ate:							
Chapter Inspection.									
Chapter inspection.									
Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:									
Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement:									
Inspector's Findings:									

20 reimbursable services contracts (RSC) initiated between May 2008 and May 2009 were inspected. Sgt. Kevin Briggs, Officer Paul Cheever, Office Assistant Ellaina Klobas, and OSSI Poornima Deo are all involved in the processing and management of the Area RSC program.

- 3. Remarks: Only 1 of 5 records was for a detail with a state agency. There was no agency billing code for that agency on the paperwork. This detail was handled by an employee who is no longer assigned to the Hayward Area. Current employee is aware of this requirement.
- **4.** Remarks: Only 1 of 5 records was for a detail with a state agency. There was no agency billing code for that agency on the paperwork. This detail was handled by an employee who is no longer assigned to the Hayward Area. Current employee is aware of this requirement.
- 7. Although 1 permit was referenced, not copies of any permits were present.
- 14. Advance deposits are being collected, but not for every detail, although Area has not had a detail since June 2008
- **15.** One of 3 advance deposit checks had a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company.
- **17.** One of 3 contracts with advance deposits had a copy of the contract attached to the weekly transmittal. No film details were performed so there were no CHP 169s.
- **18.** Area does not maintain a CHP 466. This is in part due to the fact that there have no R-Numbers issued to Area during this fiscal year. There is also no log for the 07/08 fiscal year, but there were only 5 R-Numbers issued during that fiscal year.
- 20. No log is maintained by Area.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: Hayward	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter: 8
Inspected by: Tina Cook		Date: 5/26/2009

DATE

DATE

- 23. Only copies of RSAs were present at Area, but all of those were from the previous fiscal year. There are no records from the current fiscal year since the new policy revision.
- 24. The Command proceeds with all RSAs, but does not ensure the needed permits are obtained.
- 30. Area performed a safety services detail for another agency, but not under a statewide agreement. The CHP 312 and 313 were completed, but the CHP 312 was not signed.
- 33. Five of 5 contracts were not processed within 5 days because there was no Captain or Lieutenant assigned to Area for a 30 day period when these details were completed.
- 35. Area does not maintain a log, therefore this is not completed.
- 36. Area does not maintain a log, therefore this is not completed.
- 37. Area does not maintain a log, therefore this is not completed.
- 52. Command is not informed of delinquent companies.

	companies.	
Effective controls are now in place to ens	sure policy and procedures are b	peing followed.
Commander's Response: ⊠ Concur or	☐ Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur	shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non etc.)	concurrence by commander (e.g., find	ings revised, findings unchanged,
Required Action		
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		
None required.	11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-	
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1. Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE -

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE

employee Concur

Reviewer discussed this report with

Do not concur

Memorandum

Date:

July 1, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Golden Gate Division

File No.:

301.13154

Subject:

CHAPTER 8 INSPECTIONS - SANTA ROSA AREA

On June 9-10, 2009, Golden Gate Division Inspection Team #1; Lieutenant Dane Lobb, Sergeant Jim Libby and AGPA Tina Cook, conducted a Division level inspection. The inspection team utilized the guidelines found in Chapter 8 of HPM 22.1, for this inspection. Furthermore, the team used a CHP form 680U for the inspection. The goal of the inspection was to determine the level of compliance with CHP policy found in Chapter 6 of HPM 11.1, reimbursable services agreements (RSA's) and in Chapter 20 of HPM 11.1 the DUI cost recovery program. AGPA Cook inspected the records and procedures used by the Santa Rosa Area for RSA's. Sergeant Libby reviewed the procedures and inspected the records for Santa Rosa Area's DUI cost recovery program. The inspection team was assisted by Santa Rosa Area personnel who provided requested records.

The inspection team reviewed a random sample consisting of ten percent of Area's CHP 735s from the previous 12 months and subsequently made the following findings:

This inspection found that Area had failed to forward nine of 26 cases to FMS within the required 10-day period. Area uses a CHP 735A to track cases. Area was not able to consistently provide a CHP 415 for each officer involved in a qualifying event. The Area Court Officer oversees the 735 program and the management team provides oversight and review. All personnel involved in the tracking of these events have a clear understanding of policy, the process and the deadlines.

The Area Lieutenant reduces the total amount of time taken to investigate, and document qualifying events. The reduced time is based upon the amount of time management feels would be appropriate. Area does not have a method for tracking of non-collision DUI arrests which meet the criteria for cost recovery.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 July 1, 2009

24 Reimbursable Services Agreements were reviewed. Area has an effective system in place to ensure all RSAs are processed in a timely fashion and in compliance with policy. Minor errors were noted as outlined on the attached spreadsheet. Errors found during the inspection were typically data entry omissions. These errors did not have an impact on the processing of the agreements.

The discrepancies found during this inspection were reviewed and discussed with the Command. The Command has initiated appropriate corrective procedures to minimize a reoccurrence.

Dane Lobb Lieutenant

Attachments

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command Division Santa Rosa Golden Gat	Number: 360
Evaluated by: Tina Cook, AGPA	Date 6/9/09
Assisted by:	Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

			and the second s			
TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signat	ure:	1)	
☑ Division Level [Command Level		11	1	1	
Office of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection		11/1	Je M	and the state of the	
Follow-up Required:	☐ Follow-Up Inspection	Command	er's Signature): 		Date:
☐ Yes ☒ No	BY:	160	cley	you		7-1-09
For applicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.		0/	7		
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is che	cked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for e	xplanatior	1.	
Prior to the performance of contracting party informed services, departmental equal cancellation policy?	of the rates charged for uipment usage, and	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks	
Does the billing rate includ expenses such as uniform		⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
When a safety service is p agency, is the agency's fiv obtained?		☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No pertained to the known.	records inspected is policy, but policy is
 Is the billing code documer Services Billing Memorand 		☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A		records inspected is policy, but policy is
 Is \$50 charged for each Chassigned to the detail if the less than 24 hours prior to 	cancellation notification is	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
 Is a minimum payment of 4 when employee(s) could no cancellation of their service 	ot be notified of the	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
 Is information regarding the necessary right-of-way clear requirements, and other pe available to inquiring partie 	arances or permits, local rtinent information made	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
8. Are written requests for spetthe appropriate command?		⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks	and the second second second second
Are traffic control services I approved by Division?		Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
Are traffic control services of more approved by the Offic		⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
Are extraordinary protective Assistant Commissioner, Fi	services approved by the	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance de	posits,		1	
12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log	(2222)		22200000	Do and dec
number requested from Division for every contract?		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with				Remarks:
policy?		☐ No	□ N/A	IZEITIAINS.
14. Are advance payments collected from the contracting	57.4	(m)		Remarks:
company prior to the start of the service?		☐ No	□ N/A	- Contained
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting	N V	[] Ala	□ N/A	Remarks:
company upon receipt of advance payments? 16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal		☐ No	□ N/A	
Management Section upon completion of the	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
contractual service(s)?	□ Tes	□ INO		
17 Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly				<u> </u>
CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: 2 of nine records has 1 st
The state of the s		23110	1	page of CHP 465, but not signed 2 nd
			1	page. Three were missing required CHP 169
Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agre	eements,	Antorressimo et en	in the second second	
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	7	Υ	Т	I
To. Is a CITE 400 maintained?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
19. Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote	M 163	1110	1 [7] [3,4,7	
reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
year, three digit location code, and a sequential	<u> </u>		[
number for each agreement?				
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal		W.F.		
year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks: A new log is started but
with the sequential number 001?				some numbers are not obtained sequentially because of how numbers
·				are issued to the film commission for
				movie details in this Division.
21. Are all sequential numbers accounted for when	F-3			Remarks:
reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?		☐ No	□ N/A	(Northanks.
22. Are sequential numbers not matching Billing	57	c	C7	Remarks:
Memorandums reconciled?		☐ No	□ N/A	
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	NZI V = 4	lm3 Na		Remarks:
O.A. Door the command was and with all DOA		☐ No	□ N/A	
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA	MV	□ No	[] NI/A	Remarks: All details done, but all
arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor	│ 🏻 Yes │	☐ No	□ N/A	permits not obtained.
has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances,				
and permits? 25. Is the indemnification clause included in the				
agreement when requested?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks.
26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause			EZ IAIX	CONTRACTOR AND ALL SOCIETY CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR TO A STREET CONTRACTOR OF THE STREET
approved by the Department of General Services,	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Office of Legal Services?	(,, 103	[_] 140	ואין ובא	
27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a				A ALL PARTIES COMMENT OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTIES OF THE PARTIE
CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Services Unit?	دي ١٠٠٠			

COZEEP/MAZEEP Records Inspected.	14	!		All from last 12 months.
Inspection Information	Yes	No	N/A	Remarks
SPC Used for OT	14	ı İ		
\$50 or 4 hour cancellation claimed	T	1	1	
when appropriate.	14	1	1	
Reconcilation report reconciled with				
415s	14	1	1	
SPCs verified	14		7.0	
Corrections noted on Reconcilation		1	1	Totals not changed after corrections and 1 record has a correction in the package, but the
Reports	1	i .	3	correction was not indicated on paperwork.
Reconciliation reports approved and				The state of the s
dated by by Commander.	14	1	1	All were approved by the Commander, but 11 did were not dated.
Original forwarded to Division by 15th.	1	§ 1	ol	Ten of the records were not dated so it is unknown if they were submitted by the 15th.

Aurira/Insp Fire -

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command:	Division:	Number:
Evaluated by:	1058	Date: 6-8-09
Assisted by:		Date:

RGA ONLY -

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signat	ure:			
Division Level	Command Level		1				
C) Office of Increasions	Voluntary Californian		an	- ,			
Office of Inspections	X Voluntary Self-Inspection			/			
Follow-up Required:	☐ Follow-Up Inspection	Command	er's Signature) :		Date:	
Yes No	BY:						
		 				L	
For applicable policies, refer to	o HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.	1					
		}					
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is che	ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	ilized for e	xplanation	· Terri 12"	26	- 1
1 Prior to the performance		red			Remarks:		
contracting party informed services, departmental ed		X Yes	□ No	□ N/A	1		
cancellation policy?	dopinent usage, and				465	,	
Does the billing rate inclu		-					
expenses such as uniform		⊠ Yes	□ No	N/A	Remarks		
3. When a safety service is		⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	¥	
agency, is the agency's fi obtained?	ve-aigit billing code	MY 162		I C IVA			
4. Is the billing code docume	ented on the Reimbursable						
Services Billing Memoran		Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
5. Is \$50 charged for each C		₩ Vaa		□ N/A	Remarks:		
less than 24 hours prior to	e cancellation notification is the scheduled service?	X Yes	☐ No	L IN/A			
6. Is a minimum payment of							-
when employee(s) could it		X Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
cancellation of their service							
 Is information regarding the necessary right-of-way clean 		X Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	RMD CONTACT	++
requirements, and other p		Z 100		L	NAME	/CONTACT	- 11
available to inquiring parti	es?						
8. Are written requests for sp		No.			Remarks:	JAPA CHP	
the appropriate command 9. Are traffic control services		XX Yes	□ No	□ N/A		white cite	-,
approved by Division?	iesa tilati ψου,σου	X Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
Are traffic control services		1			C		
more approved by the Offi		Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		المر ووقيد
11. Are extraordinary protective Assistant Commissioner R		□ Yes	[] No	N/A	Remarks	Q/DIV	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

Ques	tions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance de	posits.			
12	I. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	MOVIE DETAILS COLLECT. Remarks: DAY OF SERVICE.
	. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	ĭ ⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
16	Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	X Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	X Yes	□No	□ N/A	Page 1 or 465 AND COP Remarks: OF NECE OF / CHECK
Quest	ions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agre	ements.			
18	. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19.	Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	Yes Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: DIV1910~ LOG
20.	Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	XX) Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: LLOSEDOVT.
21.	Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	X Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Sequential
Z 22.	Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	Yes	□ No	N/A	Remarks:
23.	Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: ARCA W/CORRECT
24.	Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	X√Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: CAPP IS LAST TO APPRIONE COUNTY
25.	Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested? NEVEL REQ TO DATE	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks. B95/C5V
26.	Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	☐ Yes	□No	Ø N/A	Remarks: CONTRACTS UNIT WHATTHE
27.	If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78A prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:
	Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	☐ Yes	⊠ №	□ N/A	Remarks: AREA W/ CORRECT
29.	Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	N Yes	ΠNo	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

30	 Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect? 	☐ Yes	□ No	Ø N/A	Remarks:
	When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	X Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Ques	tions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pro	cedures	and reporti	ng for se	rvices provided.
L	. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
33	Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	Yes	□ No	6 N/A	Remarks:
	. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	☐ Yes	□w₀	□ N/A	Remarks:
36	Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	☐ Yes⁄	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks ⁻
37	Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	ons 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protectiv I projects.	e services	and repo	rt of over	time hours for reimbursable
	Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
40.	Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to recondile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
42.	Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
	Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	□Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
46.	Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	□ Yes	□ No.	D N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

	_		Control of the contro
Yes	6 No	□ N/A	Remarks:
□Xes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks ¹
Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ Yes ☐ No	□ Yes □ No □ N/A

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page	1	of	3
------	---	----	---

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
360	301	8
Inspected by:		Date:
G. P. Tracey	/ #14058	05/12/2009

rage 1013						
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter In shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, corre	nspectio docume	on number. Under "Forw ant shall be utilized to doc	ard to:" enter the nex ument innovative pra	actices, suggestions for statewide		
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command Level Executive Office Level Total hours expended on the inspection: 8			☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included			
Follow-up Required:		rd to: 301 ate: N/A	,			
Chapter Inspection: DUI Cost	Reco	very Program				
Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: Notwithstanding an excellent SOP for DUI Cost recovery program, the Court Officer(s) have developed a simple tracking mechanism for identifying incidents that require a CHP 735 and documenting if the CHP 735 was submitted utilizing the in Custody / Arrest Log (Book). The innovation is described in the attachments.						
Command Suggestions for Sta	itewic	le Improvement:				
Tione						
Inspector's Findings:						
Area was not in full compliance with policy as indicated in HPM 11.1, concerning time/activity documentation on the CHP 415 to support the time documented on the CHP 735. However: it is readily apparent that Area has generally reduced hours charged on the CHP 735 where adequate support via the CHP 415, CHP 202, CHP 555 are not present. Area did not have an updated SOP for the DUI Cost Recovery program but has been working diligently on formalizing procedures for the preparation/submission/approval/forwarding of the CHP 735. The draft procedures are attached to this inspection. The SOP draft is due 05/18/09. Officers have been briefed on compliance with policy as of 05/11/09.						
Commander's Response: 🗵 Concur or 🗆 Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)						

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapler:
360	301	8
Inspected by: G. P. Tracey	/ #14058	Date: 05/12/2009

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

Required Action: Update DUI Cost recovery SOP

Corrective Action Plan/Timeline: July 1, 2009

The DUI Cost Recovery protocol is attached.

The SOP revision is due 05/18/09.

A CHP 160, Briefing Item, concerning time/activity documentation for the DUI Cost Recovery program is attached.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT	
Daws 2 of 2	

Page 3 of 3

Command: 360	Division: 301	Chapter:
Inspected by: G. P. Tracey	/ #14058	Date: 05/12/2009

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE	
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	5-14-09	
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE	

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command:	Division:	Number:
Santa Rosa	Golden Gate	8
Evaluated by:	Date:	
G. P. Tracey #	05/12/2009	
Assisted by:	Date:	
P.Pappas #11	Various	
E.Heinlein #13		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signat	ure:			
Division Level	☐ Command Level	1-1					
☐ Office of Inspections ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection			Comes 11				
Follow-up Required: Yes No	Follow-Up Inspection	Commander's Signature: Date:					
For applicable policies, refer to							
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is che	cked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for e	xplanation			
Does the command have ensure that a CHP 735, In Reimbursement Statemen arrest that meets the cost	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
2. What are these procedure Field Officers are required to subn Shift Sergeants monitor the Office supporting CHP 415's are forward the Area's Arrest Log and AIS. Mo includes all Incident Response Re 735's pending court action and/or	nit the Incident Response Re rs timely submission of the re to the Court Liaison Officer a onthly summaries of the CHF imbursement Statements sub chemical tests.	eports and and proces 735 are p	cost recoversed. The (ery docun CHP 735 a Managem	nentation. The CHP 735 and are tracked through the use of ent for review. The summary		
Does the command have a assigned to process all CH	specific employee(s) P 735 forms?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
If the answer to question 3 the responsibility of proces listed in their job description	sing all CHP 735 forms	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

5.	Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
6.	to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal)	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Cases rejected by the DA or no longer qualifying for reimbursement are documented on the CHP 735A, which is kept by year and month, and the original CHP 735 is destroyed.
7.	Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? • The date of BAC results of =.08% were received	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver				
8.	Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11.	Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12.	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Until recently staff hours on the 415 were not compared to the 735. If the hours were viewed as excessive, based on the court officer

INSPECTION PROGRAM

				review of the arrest/collision report — the 735 hours were reduced accordingly with management approval. This practice has resulted in very few DUI cost recovery disputes in the last 5 years, (17).
13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Officers have been briefed of Policy (CHP 160 05/11/09)
14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Officers have been briefed on Policy (CHP 160 05/11/09)
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
18. Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	☐ Yeş	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command trace. The area has a tracking system that is superior to the use of the system is attached. The CHP 735A is used to document non qualifying CHP 735s at CHP 735s for that year and month.	CHP 735	A as the or	nly tracking	g mechanism. That tracking

INSPECTION PROGRAM

20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information FMS Information BAC test results	⊠ Yes	□ №	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: The CHP 735A documents non qualifying cases – the original 735 is destroyed.
23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: 1 st Quarter 2009 average ≃ 7 days.
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Division: Golden Gate Chapter:

8 Date:

06/10/2009

Inspected by: J. Libby

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide

Command:

Santa Rosa

improvement, identified deficiencies, co				
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command Level Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection:		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa			
Chapter Inspection:	we look		Nagyari ryan-f	
Inspector's Comments Regar	SOUTH TENEDOWN	The second secon	ene een enstant steats	Could be to the Control of the Contr
The Lieutenant reviewing and signing CHP 735's will reduce the amount billed on the CHP 735 is time spent on the DUI investigation is excessive. The Santa Rosa Area will send memoranda out to Officers who have transferred out, yet still need submit either CHP 415's or CHP 735's. Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Santa Rosa Area has suggested a fixed rate for reimbursement for CHP 735's. This amount work guideline and could be adjusted for unusual circumstances. Currently, there is no AIS entry which allows for tracking of non-collision DUI arrests which meet criteria for Cost Recovery.				
Inspector's Findings:				
An Inspection of procedures for 2009. The inspection examine team and court officer understa	ed 26 o	f the 260 events re	equiring a CHP	
Area utilizes a CHP 735A to er	nsure t	he proper and time	ely submission o	of CHP 735's.
10. There have been no reported arrests of transients. 23. Area does not process CHP 735 overpayments.				

Commander's Response:
☐ Concur or ☐ Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOC	UMENT
----------------	-------

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter
Santa Rosa	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:		Date:
J. Libby		06/10/2009

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non etc.)	concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised	d, findings unchanged,
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	The South Control of the South Control on the South So	e in the second of the second of
None required.		
		(4)
		34
		**
6		
80		
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	7/30/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	7/30/09
☐ Reviewer discussed this report with employee ☐ Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	8-6-09

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command: Santa Rosa	Division: Golden Gate	Number: 345	
Evaluated by: Sergeant James Libby		Date: 06/10/2009	
Assisted by E. Heinlein/ P	1000	Date 06/10/2009	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Inspe	ctor's Signati	ire:	17	
☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level					
Office of Inspections Voluntary Self-Inspection		Week	odi-	tte	
Follow-up Required:	Commander's Signature: 14. Cly your 7-1-0.				
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20.		0	7	0	
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	cplanation.		
Does the command have sufficient procedures to ensure that a CHP 735, Incident Response Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks.	
The Santa Rosa Court Officer examines each arrest report to determine whether or not the arrest meets the criteria for DUI cost recovery. The Court Officer makes an entry directly into the booking log to indicate a CHP 735 is required ('X' for collision, 'O' for non-collision response). The Court Officer makes the AIS entry and initials 'Y' at the bottom of the arrest report to indicate a CHP 735 is required and the report has been entered into AIS. The Court Officer provides the completed CHP 735's to the reviewing Lieutenant, makes a copy for a discovery file, and forwards the documents to clerical so they can be sent to FMS.					
 Does the command have a specific employee(s) assigned to process all CHP 735 forms? 	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
4. If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms listed in their job description or any other document?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
5. Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

 6. Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal) 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks The command has access to the local District Attorney's computer, allowing the Court Officer to access conviction/warrant data.
 7. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received 	⊠ Yes	□ No	[] N/A	Remarks:
for a commercial driver 8. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? • The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test • The arrest was for drugs only • A BAC of < .08% was obtained	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
10. If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	[] Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks. No transient arrests were noted in AIS.
11. Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

Departmen an incident included in Respon On-Sce Follow- Report Vehicle Call Ba Field Sc Transp	Storage ck obriety Testing ortation J sal Testing	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are the state fieutenants, time spent programmer from the contract of the contract from the contra	f hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for performing the activities listed in question secklist and not exclusively supervisory	⊠ Yes	□ No	[] N/A	Remarks.
16. Is the curre	nt hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out ands via Comm-Net from FMS, being	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	the CHP 735 being retained at the nd filed?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
track cases Program?	nand utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19 In the absen	ce of a CHP 735A, how is the command tra Rosa CHP Area is using the CHP 735A.	acking the	DUI Cost R	Recovery F	Program?
track cases of Program including some properties of the Program in Program in the	nt Information Information formation ormation	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are cases no months after	ot resulting in a conviction within 12 submission to the District Attorney ter court verification of case status?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22. Do closed of a line drawn FMS as well	ut cases on the monitoring system have through the Conviction Date and Date to as the reason the case was closed and	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

Page

4 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Santa Rosa CHP has not had any refunds or overpayments
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.		Vision (Vision)		
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

Memorandum

Date:

May 29, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Golden Gate Division

File No.:

360.14058

Subject:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM - DIVISION LEVEL INSPECTION

2ND QUARTER 2009

On May 28, 2009, in accordance with the Command Inspections Program Manual, HPM 22.1, I conducted a Division Level inspection at Solano Area concerning Chapter 8, Command Reimbursable Services and the DUI Cost Recovery Program. My Area contact for the inspection was Captain Susan Ward.

Area has 23 reimbursable services agreements (RSAs) for fiscal year 2007/2008 and 2008/2009. 5 RSAs were selected randomly for inspection.

Area does not maintain a local RSA log (CHP 466). The Division log is used to reconcile the RSA numbers and service provided dates. Area will implement a RSA log to facilitate tracking agreements and to document the submission of the billing memorandum (CHP 467) to Fiscal Management Section. Area will document the closing of each RSA per fiscal year on the CHP 466.

Area will keep signed original RSAs in local files. Previously, Area was submitting original RSAs to Fiscal Management Section (FMS).

Area will follow up on mileage reimbursement for grant funded services provided in the City of Oakland (CalGrip), and for traffic control services provided to the City of Fairfield.

I inspected 20 of the 107 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements (CHP 735) prepared within the last twelve months. 13 of 20 were submitted to FMS in accordance with departmental policy. 6 of 20 Daily Field Record (CHP 415) recorded times did not support the recorded times on the CHP 735. 1 of 20 did not indicate the cause of the incident response but the documented blood alcohol content confirmed the subject was driving under the influence.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 May 29, 2009

Area had CHP 735 tracking procedures in place which were functional. Area self inspected prior to the Division level inspection and has updated procedures to ensure full compliance with policy. Area has briefed changes to local procedures to ensure staff hours documented on the CHP 415 agrees with staff activity hours documented on the CHP 735.

G. P. TRACEY

Lieutenant

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Command: Solano	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
Inspected by: G. P. Tracey		Date: 05/28/2009

Page 1 of 3				
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, cor	Inspecti docume	on number. Under "Forwa ent shall be utilized to doc	ard to:" enter the nex ument innovative pra	actices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION ☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Divisio	rd to: Golden Gate	C.	
SECULATION OF THE PROPERTY OF	Chi in a	kodniki diskon Kodis		to distribute a succession that the distribution of the in a little is
Chapter Inspection: 8 - Comr	mand l	Reimbursable Serv	ices	the efficient and an interest to be suffered to the
Inspector's Comments Regar				Section 1996 (1994) and appropriate the section of
Trispedict o Certification (Cogar	41119 11			
None				
Command Suggestions for St	atewic	le Improvement:		
None				i)
Inspector's Findings:				
Solano Area has 16 reimbursa FY 07/08 and 08/09 Area has 2 agreements were inspected. A coordinator and the Command	23 rein VII reim	nbursable services	agreements. 5	28, 2008 and May 28, 2009. For reimbursable services wed and discussed with the
Area reconciles their reimbursa Area will implement a local RS, dates to Fiscal Management So year.	A log (CHP466) to track a	igreement / bill	ing memorandum submission
Area will keep the signed origin	al RS	A (CHP465) and se	end copies to F	MS.
4 Special Project Code (SPC) of CalGrip-Oakland and SPC 265 reimbursement is indicated.	overtim -City o	ne reports were ins f Fairfield will be re	pected, 2 requi	ire follow up by Area. SPC 764, a to determine if mileage
Commander's Response:	Concui	r or 🔲 Do Not Con	cur (Do Not Conc	ur shall document basis for response)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command: Solano	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
Inspected by: G. P. Tracev	014058	Date: 05/28/2009

Inspector's	Comments:	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., fi	ndings revised, finding	s unchanged,
etc.)				

Required Action:

Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:

See Commander's Corrective Action Plan attached.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:		
Solano	Golden Gate	8		
Inspected by:		Date:		
G. P. Trace	014058	05/28/2009		

	· ·	
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	6/25/09.
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	5/28/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

Memorandum

Date:

August 12, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Solano Area

File No.:

365.14402.11759

Subject:

DUI COST RECOVERY CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

Area has reviewed the findings of the recent Chapter 8 inspection relating to DUI cost recovery procedures currently in place.

In response to the recommendations made by the inspection team, Area has updated the Standard Derating Procedures Manual to clearly delineate each employee's responsibility in the generation, review, and processing the each CHP 735 form. The specific actions and responsibilities addressed are consistent with current policy.

Additionally, all area supervisors were trained at a staff meeting to ensure they clearly understand their critical role in the proper and timely completion of a CHP 735 in every applicable circumstance. The administrative sergeant has prepared a lesson plan which he will present at the next area training day to remind officers of the proper way to complete the CHP 735 and all supporting documents. Finally, the Area CHP 735 clerk was briefed and trained on her role in the processing of all CHP 735s.

It is expected that the above action steps will be completed by October 1, 2009. Each action item above will properly address each exception noted by the Inspection Team.

S. K. Ward, Captain

Commander

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Solano	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by: G. P. Tracey	014058	Date: 05/28/2009

Page 1 of 3

manage 1013			The state of the s
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typ number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspesshall be routed to and its due date. This document improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective	ection number. Under "Forwar iment shall be utilized to docui	d to:" enter the nex ment innovative pra	t level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Total hours expended	on the	□ Corrective Action Plan Included
☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level	inspection:		
Executive Office Level	3		Attachments Included
Poliow-up Required.	ward to: Golden Gate ision		
⊠ Yes □ No	Date: June 30, 2009		24 ×
reache sicility and which come in	Date: June 30, 2009	distribution of the state of	Mark Balling Ball Rolling Control (1984) Johns
Chapter Inspection: 8 – DUI Cos			
Inspector's Comments Regarding		ng nga matang milinga miling pang managan	4.116.126.02.4
			The state of the s
None			
Command Suggestions for Statev	vide Improvement:		
None			*
Inspector's Findings:			
Area did a self inspection, prior to t exceptions to policy and procedure Commander's Corrective Action Pla 107 DUI Cost recovery forms (CHP	and make proactive can for details.	changes to ens	sure compliance. See the
inspected.			
13 of 20 were submitted to Fiscal N	lanagement Section (I	FMS) on time.	
6 of 20 had Daily Field Record (CH CHP 735.	P 415) recorded times	s that did not s	upport the recorded times on the
1 of 20 did not indicate the cause of content confirmed the person was c			e documented blood alcohol
Commander's Response: Conc	ur or 🗍 Do Not Conci	ur (Do Not Conc	ur shall document basis for response)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

 Command
 Division.
 Chapter.

 Solano
 Golden Gate
 8

 Inspected by:
 Date:

 G. P. Tracey 014058
 05/28/2009

Page 2 of 3

	Shall address non concurrence by commander	
etc.)		

AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	yaylapekalanakari 1771 ertapitari 1861 et
Required Action:	
AND COUNTY OF THE PROPERTY OF	gerado de Englis de Contracto dos dos industrios da Reducida
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:	

See Commander's Corrective Action Plan attached

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command.	Division.	Chapter:
Solano	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by: G. P. Tracey 014058		Date: 05/28/2009
G. F. Hacey 0 14000		OOILOIMOOO

Page 3 of 3

		(e)
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 6/25/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	5/2-8/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
INSPECTION PROGRAM
CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command: Solano	Division: Golden Gate	Number:	
Evaluated by: G. P. Tracey 014058		Date: 05/28/2009	
Assisted by: N/A		Date.	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ctor's Signatu	ire:	>	
□ Division Level □	Command Level	. (ata	- Ima	eky	
Office of Inspections	Voluntary Self-Inspection		- Comment	L	- (*	
N Voc	Follow-Up Inspection BY:	Consmande	er's)Signature	کارو()	6/25/09
For applicable policies, refer to H	IPM 11.1, Chapter 20.					
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is check		shall be uti	lized for ex	planation		
Does the command have suffered that a CHP 735, Incident Reimbursement Statement, in arrest that meets the cost records.	dent Response is prepared for each	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks	*
2. What are these procedures?					7-11-100-1-1-11-100-1-1	
Area conducted a self inspection prid See the Commander's Corrective Ac			pdated/cor	rected pro	ocedures.	
In summary:						
The CHP 735 is attached to the CHP The Court Officer enters the date the The Admin Sgt suspense(s) the hard When the BAC is received a civilian some Admin Sgt does a daily/weekly A updates the AIS. (See Attachments)	735 was received into the copy 735. support position enters that NS check – finalizes approp	date into t		e 735(s) a	approved ar	nd sent to FMS, and
Additionally: the Area SOP was upda (See Attachments)	ated for officer / supervisor(s) and civi	lian suppor	rt respons	sibilities con	cerning the 735.

Page 2 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

	 Does the command have a specific employee(s) assigned to process all CHP 735 forms? 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks Admin Sgl
Ì	4. If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms listed in their job description or any other document?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: SOP (Attached)
	5. Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	 6. Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal) 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	 7. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
	 8. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained 	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area Corrected
	9. Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

10. If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None to date.	
11. Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
12. Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area Corrected	
13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the	1	r	T		
billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area Corrected	
14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
 Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control 					
15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	[] Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None to date	
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks.	
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
18. Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Implemented May 2009	
19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command tracking the DUI Cost Recovery Program? Previously the Court Officer checked Court records weekly and advised the Admin Sgt when results/dispos were present to ustify approval of the 735, which was then signed by a manager and routed to FMS.					

INSPECTION PROGRAM

20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information FMS Information BAC test results	⊠Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Court Info and BAC Test Results
21. Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area Corrected
22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area Corrected
23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of ≈ \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks*
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: HQ

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command: Solano	Division: Golden Gate	Number:
Evaluated by: G. P. Tracey	Date: 05/28/2009	
Assisted by: N/A		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF	INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signatu	ire:	>
	vision Level	Command Level	(MAGA	Imac	CRY
OI	fice of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	7	-0	F 1 335	1
	ollow-up Required: ☑ Yes ☐ No	Follow-Up Inspection	Commande	er)s Signature	and	Date:
For a	pplicable policies, refer t	o HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.		the state of the s		7
Note:	If a "No" or "N/A" box is ch	ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	planation	•
1.	Prior to the performance	of services, is the ed of the rates charged for	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
2.		m or equipment damage?		☐ No	N/A	Remarks
3 When a safety service is provided to another state agency, is the agency's five-digit billing code obtained?			☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks No SSP Inspected
Is the billing code documented on the Reimbursable Services Billing Memorandum?			☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks. No SSP Inspected
5 Is \$50 charged for each CHP uniformed employee assigned to the detail if the cancellation notification is less than 24 hours prior to the scheduled service?				□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
6.	Is a minimum payment of when employee(s) could cancellation of their service		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
7 Is information regarding the procedures to obtain necessary right-of-way clearances or permits, local requirements, and other pertinent information made available to inquiring parties?		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
8.				☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks
Are traffic control services less than \$50,000 approved by Division?			X YesX Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks
10		estimated to be \$50,000 or ice of the Commissioner?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks
11,		ve services approved by the	☐ Yes	[] No	EX] N/A	Remarks Division Handles

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance de	posits.			
12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	∏ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks.
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks, Hand Delivered
16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agr	eements.			
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area Uses Dívision Log
19. Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area Uses Division Log
Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Division Handles
22 Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks Area Corrected / Had sent originals to FMS
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	[] No	□ N/A	Remarks .
25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: CHP78A – City of Fairfield (BR# 23-0102)
28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Commander Verified
29. Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	⊠ Yes	П №	[] N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467	1_	1		Demoka: No statewide agreements
forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	Yes	∏ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No statewide agreements
31. When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pro	ocedures a	and reporti	ing for se	rvices provided.
32. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None
33. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	⊠ Yès	∏ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
34. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks
35. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks Area Corrected
36. Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area Uses Division Log / Area Will Implement Local Log
37. Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
38. Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protective special projects.	e services	and repo	rt of over	time hours for reimbursable
39. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks. None
40. Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
41. Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
42. Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	[] N/A	Remarks
43. Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
44 Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks.
45. Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
46 Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: NLT 4 working days after

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

47	. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	∏No	□ N/A	Remarks
48	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Division
49.	Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
50.	Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
51.	Are all payments made directly to FMS?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
52.	Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: HQ Handles

AREA: SOLANO

TOTAL RECORDS: 107

RECORDS EXAMINED: 20

				ARREST FOR					
DATE OF	DATE 735	BAC/DRUG	ARREST	OTHER		CONVICTION	415	415	
ARREST	SUBMITTED	RESULTS	FOR DUI	EVENT	DATE BAC	DATE IF	ATTACHED	CORRECT	
2/22/2009	4/4/2009		T/C Y/N	(BOL) Y/N			Y/N	Y/N	NOTES
2/8/2009		0.14			4/28/2009		Υ	Υ	
5/16/2009		0.26			4/28/2009		Υ	Υ	
5/14/2009		0.11			5/16/2009	Annual Company of the	Y	Υ	735 time less than 415
		0.22			6/2/2009		Υ	N	Fitzhugh time charged twice
12/13/2008	4/22/2009	0.21			1/16/2009		Υ	Υ	Memo attached w/ time explanation
2/28/2009	4/17/2009		Unknown		2/28/2009	Unknown	Υ	N	DRE Eval?
5/15/2009	6/8/2009	0.17	Y		6/2/2009		Y	Y	735 time less than 415
7/24/2008		0.2	Y		Unknown		Y	Ÿ	1 00 time less than 410
4/8/2009		0.22	Υ		5/6/2009		Y	N	30 minutes unsupported Konvalin
3/23/2009	4/24/2009	0.23	Y		4/8/2009	***	Y	N	1 hour unsupported Shuler
5/23/2009	5/28/2009	0.15	Υ		5/23/2009		Ý	Y	Thou unoupported official
2/18/2009	4/17/2009	0.21	Υ		3/4/2009		Y	· V	735 time less than 415
9/8/2008	Unknown	0.31	Y		Unknown		Ý	·	735 time less than 415
2/9/2009	5/4/2009	0.18			4/28/2009		Ý	N	50 minutes unsupported Lovato
5/9/2009	5/26/2009	0.15	April 1997 Company of the Parket of the Park		5/21/2009		Y	N	2 hours unsupported Aguilar
4/24/2009	5/13/2009	0.16			5/11/2009		Y	Y	2 Hours disapported Aguilat
4/27/2009	5/20/2009	0.3			5/14/2009		Ÿ	Ÿ	
2/14/2009	4/17/2009	0.19		,	2/14/2009		 	· ·	
4/22/2009	5/13/2009	0.22			5/11/2009		\\ \\ \	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	
4/15/2009	5/14/2009	0.22			5/11/2009		Y	Y	

Memorandum

Date:

June 1, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Santa Rosa Area

File No.:

360.14058

Subject:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM - DIVISION LEVEL INSPECTION

2ND QUARTER 2009

On May 26, 2009, in accordance with the Command Inspections Program Manual, HPM 22.1, I conducted a Division Level inspection at Cordelia Inspection Facility, CIF, concerning Chapter 8, Reimbursable Services and the DUI Cost Recovery Program. My contact for the inspection was Lieutenant Mike Ferrell. Lieutenant Ferrell is the CIF Commander, and we had met and discussed the inspection process prior to my arrival. I was aware that CIF had proactively self inspected their applicable files. CIF does not engage in any reimbursable services and has no DUI Cost Recovery Program files. The CIF overtime report files were inspected. Lieutenant Ferrell was personally involved in the inspection process and was very open to suggestions for improvement.

If you have any questions concerning this memorandum, please contact me at the Santa Rosa Area at (707) 588-1400.

G. P. TRACEY, Lieutenant Field Operations Officer

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Cordelia IF	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:	Date:	
G. P. TRACEY	05/26/2009	

Page 1 of 3

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command: Cordelia IF	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
Inspected by: G. P. TRACE	Date: 05/26/2009	

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

Required Action: None

Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:

None

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command:	Division;	Chapter:
Cordelia IF	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:	Date:	
G. P. TRACE	G. P. TRACEY 014058	

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE . a. Devel	DATE 6-5-09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	6-1-09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
INSPECTION PROGRAM
CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command: Cordelia IF	Division: Golden Gate	Number:
Evaluated by: G. P. TRACEY	Date: 05/26/2009	
Assisted by:	Date:	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section.

Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

		100 - 10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-1					
TYPE OF INSPECTION				ector's Signat	ure:		
☐ Div	vision Level	Command Level	Smar				
	ice of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection		Arm (7		
Fo	ollow-up Required:	Follow-Up Inspection	Command	er's Signature		Date:	
] Yes 🛛 No	BY:			7-	nell 6-5-09	
<u> </u>			<u> </u>	ر مر شر ^۱	() ro	nell 6-3-07	
		o HPM 11.1, Chapter 6.					
Note: I	f a "No" or "N/A" box is ch	ecked the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation		
1.	Euror to the behormance	of services, is the				Remarks: CIF has no reimbursable	
	services, departmental e	d of the rates charged for	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	service agreements.	
	cancellation policy?						
2.	Does the billing rate inclu	ide mileage and other			<u> </u>		
	expenses such as uniform	n or equipment damage?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
3.	When a safety service is	provided to another state			1	Remarks:	
	agency, is the agency's fi obtained?	ve-aigit billing code	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks.	
4.		ented on the Reimbursable					
	Services Billing Memoran	dum?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
5.	Is \$50 charged for each (CHP uniformed employee				_	
	assigned to the detail if th	e cancellation notification is		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
6.	less than 24 hours prior to	4 hours overtime charged	-) 9:1	
	when employee(s) could i	not be notified of the		□No	□ N/A	Remarks: COZEEP / MAZEEP	
	cancellation of their service	ce(s)?	23 100			€	
7.	Is information regarding th	ne procedures to obtain					
	necessary right-of-way cle	earances or permits, local	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: COZEEP / MAZEEP	
	available to inquiring parti	ertinent information made					
8. ,	Are written requests for so	pecific services directed to					
i	the appropriate command	?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
9. /	Are traffic control services	less than \$50,000				D	
10	approved by Division?	estimated to be \$50,000 or	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A.	Remarks:	
10. /	nore approved by the Offi	ce of the Commissioner?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
11. A	Are extraordinary protective	e services approved by the	169	L 140	, IVA		
	Assistant Commissioner, F	ield?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance of	leposits.	Santante.	765°C 4760	
			Andrew State Control	
12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	Пуез		57	Remarks:
13. Is a Chr 465 form completed in accordance with		No	N/A	Tremains.
poncy?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
14. Are advance payments collected from the contractin	9		1 23 14/1	*
Company prior to the start of the service?		☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?				Remarks:
16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal	Yes	☐ No	N/A	ixemarks.
ivianagement Section upon completion of the	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Contractual Service(s)?			2 10//	
17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly				
CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169? Questions:18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of ag	_	│	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人,我们就是一个人	reements.			
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	1,350	100 100 100 100	#15 NO - 27 SEC 17 PC	
19 Do RSA numbers basis with the same	☐ Yes	☐ No	J ⊠ N/A	Remarks:
 Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal 			_	Demodia:
year, trifee digit location code, and a segmential	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
number for each agreement?				1
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal		 		
year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	☐ Yes	☐ No	N/A ⊠	Remarks:
21. Are all sequential numbers accounted for when	<u> </u>			
reconding with the Billing Memorandum?	Yes	☐ No	 ⊠ N/A	Remarks:
22. Are sequential numbers not matching Billing	1 [163		I WINA	
ivernorandums reconciled?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?				
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
has obtained the necessary right-of-way clearances			Z IV/A	₹
ald belilies?				
25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?			57	Remarks:
26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks.
approved by the Department of General Services	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Unice of Legal Services?			١١٠/١	
27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract				
Services Unit?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or				-
ordinance of the local governing body obtained when	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?				
29. Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office				
of Dignitary Protection?	□Yes	No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 312 forms, and CUD 467				
30. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
31. When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	☐ Yes		⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement p		and report	ing for se	rvices provided.
32. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when) .	1	*** **********************************	
tees are collected on the day of the training session?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
33. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upor completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and	∏ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Special projects) within 5 days?				
34. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	Yes	□ No	N/A	Remarks:
35. Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
36. Is a copy of the command's Reimburşable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
37. Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?		□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
38. Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?				D
Questions 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protecti	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Special projector	ve services	anu repo	rcorover	time nours for reimbursable
39. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
40. Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
41. Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
42. Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43. Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
44. Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
45. Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: A manual tracking system (date) for report submission has been implemented
•46. Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: NLT 4 working days after end of FLSA unless extended.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

Myss			Remarks:
Yes	□ No	N/A N/A	Remarks:
⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	∀es Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes No Yes No Yes No	Yes No N/A Yes No N/A Yes No N/A Yes No N/A

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Division: Marin Area Golden Gate		Chapter: Chapter 8
Inspected by:		Date:
Sergeant Osu	05/11/2009	

Page 1 of 3

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co	Inspecti docume	on number. Under "Forvent shall be utilized to do	vard to:" enter the ne cument innovative p	fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter ext level of command where the document ractices, suggestions for statewide e used if additional space is required.	
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command I Executive Office Level	Total hours expended on the inspection: 12 hours		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included		
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to: ate: 05/19/2009			
Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: None					
Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: None					
Inspector's Findings: There seemed to be a conflict in several questions. Questions 23 and 33. Most reimbursable contacts and control numbers come Golden Gate Division.					
Commander's Response:	Concu	ır or □ Do Not Co	ncur (Do Not Con	cur shall document basis for response)	

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Marin Area	Golden Gate	Chapter 8
Inspected by: Sergeant Osu	na	Date: 05/11/2009

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Marin Area	Golden Gate	Chapter 8
Inspected by: Sergeant Osur		Date: 05/11/2009

:	J8W		egar ()		
Required Action	i a			 	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		 		 La libraria de al Començão	

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	S/12/09
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	Sullus Osu	DATE /1/05
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command: Marin Area	Division: Golden Gate	Number: Chapter 8
Evaluated by: Sergeant G. Osuna		Date: 05/11/2009
Assisted by:	nie / LT. Raleigh	Date: 05/12/2009

Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION illut Osu ○ Command Level ☐ Division Level Voluntary Self-Inspection Office of Inspections Commander's Signature: Follow-up Required: ☐ Follow-Up Inspection □ No ☐ Yes 05/14/2009 For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Prior to the performance of services, is the Remarks: □ N/A ☐ No ✓ Yes contracting party informed of the rates charged for services, departmental equipment usage, and On CHP 465 cancellation policy? 2. Does the billing rate include mileage and other Remarks: □ N/A Yes □ No expenses such as uniform or equipment damage? When a safety service is provided to another state Remarks: ⊠ N/A agency, is the agency's five-digit billing code ☐ Yes □ No obtained? 4. Is the billing code documented on the Reimbursable Remarks: ⊠ N/A ☐ Yes □ No Services Billing Memorandum? 5. Is \$50 charged for each CHP uniformed employee Remarks: □ N/A ☐ No ✓ Yes assigned to the detail if the cancellation notification is less than 24 hours prior to the scheduled service? 6. Is a minimum payment of 4 hours overtime charged Remarks: □ N/A Yes □No when employee(s) could not be notified of the cancellation of their service(s)? 7. Is information regarding the procedures to obtain Remarks: □ N/A ∏ No necessary right-of-way clearances or permits, local requirements, and other pertinent information made available to inquiring parties? 8. Are written requests for specific services directed to Remarks: □ N/A ∏ No X Yes the appropriate command? 9. Are traffic control services less than \$50,000 Remarks: Given R#'s □ N/A ΠNο Yes approved by Division? 10. Are traffic control services estimated to be \$50,000 or Remarks: ☐ No ⊠ N/A Yes more approved by the Office of the Commissioner? 11. Are extraordinary protective services approved by the Remarks: ⊠ N/A ☐ No Assistant Commissioner, Field? ☐ Yes

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies

with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance dep	osits.			
12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: CHP 169 does not exist
Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agree	ements.			
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Golden Gate Division
Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Golden Gate Division
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Conflict w/ 6-10 D
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	⊠ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
29. Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8 COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

	The state of the s				
30	Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Quest	ions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pro	cedures a	ind reporti	ng for sei	vices provided.
32	Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
33	Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Refer to Question 23
34	Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
35.	Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
36.	Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
37.	Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Questi	ons 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protectiv	e services	s and repo	rt of over	time nours for reinibursable
specia 39.	I projects. Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
40.	Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
41.	Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
42.	Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43.	Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
46.	Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

47.	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
48.	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
51.	Are all payments made directly to FMS?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
1	Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Marin Area	Golden Gate	Chapter:	
Inspected by: Sergeant Osu	Date: 05/12/2009		

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, cor	Inspection	on number. Under Forw ent shall be utilized to doc	ard to: enter the nex sument innovative pr	Il in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter of level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide asset if additional space is required.
TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection: 6 hours		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to: ate: 05/19/2009		
Chapter Inspection:				
Inspector's Comments Regar None Command Suggestions for Strone Inspector's Findings: This inspection revealed	tatewic	de Improvement:	ave a suspense	system in place to faciliate
notification of a conviction Influence (DUI) Cost Rec to the Court Officer.	n invol overy	ving cases meeting Program. The Are	g the requireme a will start a mo	ents of the Driving Under the conthly suspense file, as a reminder
Commander's Response:	Concu	ır or 🗌 Do Not Cor	ncur (Do Not Cond	cur shall document basis for response)
- Angelia				findings revised findings unchanged
Inspector's Comments: Shall a etc.)	address	non concurrence by c	commander (e.g., 1	findings revised, findings unchanged,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Marin Area	Golden Gate	Chapter 8
Inspected by: Sergeant Osu	- Andrews	Date: 05/12/2009

•	ALL THE STREET, SAME TO STREET,		W W V 0 70.	
Required Action			The state of the s	
	Timeline	11000001 - WH - 10000		
Corrective Action Plan	i/Timeline			

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	5/18/09
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	Dulut Osine	5/12/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	RÉVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

Page

1 of 4

Remarks: Arrest Procedures Binder

with Instructions.

 \square N/A

☐ No

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command: Marin Area	Division: Golden Gate	Number: Chapter 8
Evaluated by: Sergeant G. Osuna		Date: 05/11/2009
Assisted by: LT. Raleigh, O Adams	SS I Mares, OA	Date: 05/18/2009

with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Followup Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION □ Command Level Division Level Office of Inspections Date Commander's Signature Follow-up Required: Follow-Up Inspection ☐ Yes □ No 05/18/2009: For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Does the command have sufficient procedures to Remarks: Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ensure that a CHP 735, Incident Response Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria? 2. What are these procedures? Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), Officer Assistant Arrest Logs, Accident Review Officer notes. CHP 215 Collision Box 3. Does the command have a specific employee(s) Remarks: OA Adams ☐ No □ N/A Yes assigned to process all CHP 735 forms?

Yes

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies

If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is

listed in their job description or any other document?

the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

5.	Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
6.	Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal)	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Court Officer keeps a file and checks for convictions periodically.
7.	 of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver 	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
8.	 Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: None to date
	Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12.	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

bill	oes the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the lable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more an one activity?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Ar De an	e the staff hours incurred by members of the epartment for the following activities associated with incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery cluded in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
lieu tim 12 tas	e the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, utenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for e spent performing the activities listed in question of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory ks?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Pre-set
16. Is I	the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Arrest Reports
17. ls a	a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the mmand and filed?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
trac	the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to ck cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery ogram?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. In t	he absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command tra	acking the	DUI Cost F	Recovery f	Program?
trac Pro	e commands using a case monitoring system to ck cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery gram including the following information in the nitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information FMS Information	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Booking logs and tracks in AIS

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

21. Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Monitors thru EGIS
23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Done at Fiscal Management Section
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

Memorandum

Date:

June 12, 2009

То:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Golden Gate Division

File No.

360.14058

Subject:

COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM - CASTRO VALLEY AREA

On May 27, 2009, Golden Gate Inspection Team 2 comprised of Lieutenant G. Tracey, and Sergeant Ed Dela Cruz, inspected the DUI Cost Recovery Program files and Reimbursable Service Agreement files of Castro Valley Area. The Inspection Team was assisted by Lieutenant C. Day, Castro Valley Area

The Inspection Team reviewed a random sample of 35 of 139 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements (CHP 735) within the past twelve months, and made the following observations:

23 of 35: CHP 735 not submitted to Fiscal Management Section, PMS, within policy timelines.

8 of 35: No date of submission to FMS indicated.

2 of 35: Section A and B / All Boxes Checked.

1 of 35: Officer hours not separated on CHP 735

1 of 35: The CHP 735 was submitted to FMS twice.

General observations: The Daily Field Record, CHP 415(s), is attached to the CHP 735 and is reviewed for accuracy. Area self-inspected the DUI Cost recovery Program files prior to the Division Inspection, and identified that the CHP 415 "Notes" section had not been used to support CHP 735 time(s) per HPM 11.1. Area has corrected this exception. Area had no formal procedure to ensure completion of the CHP 735 prior to 09/2008. Area has developed and implemented local procedures and has briefed the DUI Cost Recovery Program policy and procedures to ensure accurate reporting of staff activity time.

Area has 5 reimbursable services agreements, (RSAs). 4 of the 5 agreements are for traffic control services with the same requesting party. 1 of the 5 reimbursable services agreements, traffic control services for the County of Alameda, is a year long agreement the billing for which is handled via Division overtime reporting, Special Project Code 877.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 June 12, 2009

Area did not have proof of county permit approval in RSA files. Area did not have county permit approval process information to provide to requesting parties.

Area did not have signed original RSAs in each file and had no method for tracking submission of the Billing Memorandum, CFIP 467, to Fiscal Management Section.

Area will prepare local procedures to indicate the required contents of an RSA file and to ensure proper approvals and timely submission of billing documents.

Area self inspected the RSA files prior to the Division inspection. Area has identified exceptions to accepted procedure and is working toward full compliance with policy.

G. P. TRACEY

Lieutenant

Memorandum

Date:

June 8, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Castro Valley Area

File No.:

375.12455.12455

Subject:

CHP 735 (DUI COST RECOVERY) INSPECTION -

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

On May 27, 2009, a Division-level inspection for the preceding 12-month period was conducted of the CHP 735 (DUI Cost Recovery) files in the Castro Valley CHP Area. In response to that inspection, the Castro Valley Area has created this Corrective Action Plan.

HISTORY:

In October 2008, it was determined that field personnel were not correctly indicating billable time on their CHP 415 (Daily Field Record). Field personnel were instructed to indicate the defendant's name or arrest case number on each line entry of the CHP 415 when a CHP 735 was to be completed. Field Personnel were also reminded that a CHP 735 was required for any alcohol-related incident that "required a response" and not simply as a result of a collision. In addition, sergeants were required to review all CHP 735 forms and the accompanying CHP 415 forms to ensure the CHP 735 was completed correctly. The sergeants were directed to initial the CHP 735 form when they finished their review.

When the Castro Valley Area learned that the DUI Cost Recovery program would be inspected, a thorough self inspection was conducted using the checklist contained in Highway Patrol Manual (HPM) 22.1, chapter 8. Several issues were identified. The self inspection revealed the following:

- All CHP 735 forms, regardless of blood alcohol results, were incorrectly forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS). Once received, FMS returned any CHP 735 that required additional follow-up.
- When the CHP 735 forms were received from FMS, there was no procedure in place to follow-up. The forms were simply filed.
- The Office Assistant responsible for submitting completed CHP 735 forms did not fully understand the program.
- There was no tracking system in place for CHP 735 forms and the optional CHP 735A form was not in use.

Safety, Service, and Security

Golden Gate Division Page 2 June 8, 2009

- There was no system in place to determine case dispositions for CHP 735 forms with blood alcohol contents under 0.08, refusals, drug-only arrests, etc.
- Several CHP 735 forms were located that were over one year old that still required follow-up. FMS was contacted and the Area was informed that any CHP 735 over 12-months old was too old to process. Those CHP 735 forms were closed and filed.
- CHP 415 forms did not indicate "billable hours" in the notes section as required by policy.

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN:

After identifying the numerous issues, the following corrective action steps were taken:

- April 2009: Lt. Day provided training to R. Amedio, #A15045, the Office Services Supervisor I, and C. Candelaria, #A13641, the Office Assistant responsible for processing CHP 735 forms. This training included an overview of the program, when CHP 735 forms were required to be sent to FMS, when CHP 735 forms required followup, timeframes for submitting completed CHP 735 forms, and how to track open CHP 735 cases.
- April 2009: Lt. Day created an Excel spreadsheet used to track CHP 735 forms. The spreadsheet included all of the required information as indicated in HPM 11.1, chapter 20.
- April 2009: Lt. Day created an advanced search in the Area Information System (AIS) that was used to determine what DUI-related collisions required a CHP 735 form. This search generated a list of collisions for 2008 and 2009.
- April 2009: Ms. Candelaria was directed to review the 2008 AIS list and determine which CHP 735 form was over 12 months old. Those CHP 735 forms were closed and filed. Ms. Candelaria was also instructed to enter all CHP 735 information for the remaining 2008 CHP 735 forms and all of the 2009 CHP 735 forms into the Excel spreadsheet. Once all of the information was entered into the spreadsheet Ms. Candelaria was able to determine which cases did not have a completed CHP 735 form even though one was required. Ms. Candelaria generated a list of missing CHP 735 forms that was forwarded to the sergeants. The sergeants were directed to meet with each officer and ensure a CHP 735 form was completed immediately.
- April 2009: Ms. Candelaria was directed to run the advanced search in AIS weekly and generate a list of any missing CHP 735 forms.
- April 2009: Lt. Day generated a briefing item regarding CHP 415 requirements when completing a CHP 735 form.
- April 2009: Officer Dilling, the Area Accident Review Officer, modified the cover sheet used when turning in a collision report to include a notation about CHP 735 forms.
- April 2009: Officer Rhoades, the Area Evidence/Court Officer, modified the cover sheet used when turning in an arrest report to include a notation about CHP 735 forms.

Golden Gate Division Page 3 June 8, 2009

• April 2009: Lt. Day met with Officer Rhoades and Sgt. Perea to discuss court follow-up procedures. On a weekly basis Ms. Candelaria was instructed to provide Officer Rhoades with a list of CHP 735 cases requiring follow-up. Officer Rhoades was instructed to take the list to court on a weekly basis and check the dispositions of the listed cases. After completing the check, Officer Rhoades was directed to provide all information to Ms. Candelaria who would, in turn, process the CHP 735 form for any case that resulted in a conviction.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE DIVISION-LEVEL INSPECTION:

- All of the issues identified in the self inspection were discussed with the Division Inspectors.
- There was no system in place to track CHP 735 forms for "transients". In June 2009, Lt. Day modified the CHP 735 Excel spreadsheet to include a column for transients and discussed properly processing of the CHP 735 forms with Ms. Candelaria and Ms. Amedio.

SUMMARY:

Although numerous issues were identified during the inspections, all of the issues have been resolved. In addition, Area will update the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) to ensure the new CHP 735 procedures are described in detail. Finally, Area will continue to take an active role in managing CHP 735 forms.

C. B. DAY, Lieutonant Acting Commander

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command Division	Chapter
CASTRO VLY GOLDEN GATE	8
Inspected by	Date
G. P. TRACEY 014058	05/27/2009

Page 1 of 3

shall be routed to and its due date. I improvement, identified deficiencies, or TYPE OF INSPECTION.	nis docum corrective	action plans. A CHP 51 Total hours expende	Wemorandum	ve practices, suggestions for statewide ay be used if additional space is required K Corrective Action Plan Included
☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level		inspection		Periodo in Linda de artico
☐ Executive Office Level			5	Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to: 301		
Due Date: June 30,				
Chapter Inspection: 8 – DUI	COST	RECOVERY	a disply in a state of the	ente i kapitaliste en e 1856 entre i 120 eus euro des principales en 1800 euro 1800 euro 1800 en 1800 et 1800 La companiation del productivo de principales de la companiation de la companiation de la companiation de la c
Inspector's Comments Rega	arding Ir	novative Practice	S:	
Vone				
VOITE				
Command Suggestions for S	Statewic	ie improvement.		

Area had no local procedure to ensure proper completion of Incident Response Reimbursement Statement, CHP 735, prior to 09/2008.

Area prepared 139 CHP 735 forms in the past twelve months. A random sampling of 35 reimbursement statements was inspected. 12 of the 35 forms were submitted to Fiscal Management Section within policy timelines. 1 statement was approved / submitted twice, but the staff activity hours remained the same, and were supported by the Daily Field Record (CHP 415). CHP 415(s) were attached to the reimbursement statements, but the recorded times were not detailed to fully support the staff activity times listed in the CHP 735, in strict accordance with departmental policy.

Area implemented tracking and submission procedures (see attachments) which are outlined in the Commander's Corrective Action Plan.

Area will implement the CHP 735A to support tracking of "Section B" 735s and "Transient" 735s.

Area will review DUI Cost Recovery program policy and procedures with all uniformed personnel and applicable non-uniformed personnel.

		(A	Demand donumant b	incid for reconneel
O- mandaria Dognongo:	Concur or Do No	at Concur (Do Not	Concur shall document is	18515 101 1635011367
Commander's Response:	_ OUTION OF L DO THE	,, CO., CO., (DO), (O.		
001111111111111111111111111111111111111				

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL COMINIAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

CASTRO VLY GOLDEN GATE	Cnapter 8
Inspected by G. P. TRACEY 014058	Date 05/27/2009

Page 2 of 3

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

Required Action:

Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:

See Commander's Corrective Action Plan attached.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command	Division	Chapter
CASTRO VLY	GOLDEN GATE	8
inspected by		Date
G. P. TRACEY)14058	05/27/2009

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE DATE 6.24-09				
(See HPM 9.1. Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	INSPECTOR'S DIGNATURE	DATE 5/27/09			
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE			

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
INSPECTION PROGRAM
CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Command Castro Valley	Golden Gate	Number		
Evaluated by		Date		
G. P. TRACEY 014058		05/27/2009		
Assisted by		Date		
E. DELACRUZ 014968		05/27/2009		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

		Lead Insp	ectors Signal	lure		
TYPE OF INSPECTION						
(∑) Division Level	Command Level	(Ames				
Office of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	عب ا				II
Follow-up Required: Yes No	Follow-Up Inspection	Commander's Signature: Date:				
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20.						
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is c	necked the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation		
 Does the command have ensure that a CHP 735, 	e sufficient procedures to Incident Response ent. is prepared for each	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks, Are	ea is working on an ctions began 10/08 and /09
2 What are Inese procedu						
Does the command have assigned to process all C		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
the responsibility of proce	3 of this checklist is yes, is essing all CHP 735 forms ion or any other document?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks SO	P attached.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

	 Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form? 	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks Area has corrected
6	Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e.,	⊠ Yes	∏ No	∏ N/A	Remarks.
7	a refusal) Are CHF 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates?	⊠ Yes	□No	│ N/A	Remarks*
	 The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver 				•
8		☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area has corrected
9	Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	[] No	[] N/A	Remarks
10	If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks The CHP 735A was not used as a tracking mechanism. Area has corrected.
11	Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12.	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area self identified / corrected this issue in 10/2008.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

13 Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	☐Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks Area began corrections 04/2009.
14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? • Response Time • On-Scene Investigation • Follow-up Investigation • Report Writing • Vehicle Storage • Call Back • Field Sobriety Testing • Transportation • Booking • Chemical Testing	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
15 Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks No incidents to date apply
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
18 Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks
In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command transfer uses a database spreadsheet, the T/C tracking covershee looking very closely at the tracking mechanisms to ensure they	et, the arre	st log and A		
20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? • Defendant Information • Violation Information • Court Information • FMS Information	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks Weekly Court Officer case disposition run

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

21	Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	☐Yes	⊠ No	AVA [_]	Remarks: Area has corrected by implementing the CHP 735A
22	Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
23.	Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks.
24	Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: As of 1 st Quarter 2009
Questi	on 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				
	Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks

Memorandum

Date:

June 8, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Castro Valley Area

File No.:

375.12455.12455

Subject:

REIMBURSABLE SERVICES AGREEMENT INSPECTION -

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

On May 27, 2009, a Division-level inspection for the preceding 12-month period was conducted of the Reimbursable Services Agreement files in the Castro Valley CHP Area. In response to that inspection, the Castro Valley Area has created this Corrective Action Plan.

HISTORY:

When the Castro Valley Area learned that the Reimbursable Services Agreement program would be inspected, a thorough self inspection was conducted using the checklist contained in Highway Patrol Manual (HPM) 22.1, chapter 8. The self inspection was conducted by Office Services Supervisor I (OSS I) R. Amedio, #A15045. The self inspection revealed the following:

- The Castro Valley Area had five (5) reimbursable services agreements. 100% of the agreements were examined.
- Four of the reimbursable services agreements were coordinated by the former OSS I. Ms. Amedio, the current OSS I, was not involved in acquiring, processing, or managing the prior agreements. Ms. Amedio was responsible for the most recent agreement. There were no errors on the agreement obtained by Ms. Amedio.
- Two of the five agreements did not have the commander's signature as required.
- Three of the five agreements did not have the original documentation on file at the Area.
- One of the agreements did not contain a copy of the county resolution.
- Two of the agreements did not have invoices sent to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) within five days as required.
- When four of the agreements were in use, the control log was not forwarded to Division as required.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 June 8, 2009

ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE DIVISION-LEVEL INSPECTION:

- There was no procedure in place to provide inquiring parties with county permit contact information.
- There was no procedure in place for the assigned officer/sergeant to notify the reimbursable services agreement coordinator in the event of a short notice cancellation, normal cancellation, or refund deposit.
- There was no procedure in place for the assigned officer/sergeant to notify the reimbursable services agreement coordinator if additional hours and mileage were expended.
- The overtime documents were kept in multiple locations (Reimbursable services agreements kept in one file; CHP 71 forms in another file; CHP 415 forms in CARS; overtime reconciliation reports kept in a binder; etc.). This made it difficult to compare all of the documents to verify the billing information.
- There was no system in place to verify when an overtime report was sent to FMS or Division.

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN:

- It is not possible to correct past errors on the reimbursable services agreements. OSS I Amedio will ensure all policies and procedures are followed for future agreements.
- Area will create a form to be provided to the requesting party that will indicate how to get the necessary permits, resolutions, etc. This form will be generated by July 1, 2009.
- Area will discuss with the Overtime Coordinator the need for timely notifications of cancellations, refunds, or additional hours and mileage used. In addition, a briefing item will be prepared to inform field personnel of the new requirements. This will be accomplished by July 1, 2009.
- The overtime documents relating to reimbursable services agreements were consolidated in June 2009. The reimbursable services agreement file now contains the agreement, other relevant documentation, and the overtime documents (CHP 415 and CHP 71 forms).
- Area will make a notation on the overtime reconciliation report showing the date it was forwarded to FMS and Division. This will occur on the next overtime report due on June 15, 2009.

Golden Gate Division Page 3 June 8, 2009

SUMMARY:

All of the identified issues from the self inspection were for past agreements. The issues identified during the Division inspection will be addressed and Area will continue to take an active role in managing reimbursable services agreements.

C. B. DAY, Lieutenant Acting Commander

Memorandum

Date:

June 1, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Santa Rosa Area

File No.:

360.14058

Subject:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM - DIVISION LEVEL INSPECTION

2ND QUARTER 2009

On May 27, 2009, in accordance with the Command Inspections Program Manual, HPM 22.1, I conducted a Division Level inspection at Castro Valley Area concerning Chapter 8, Reimbursable Services and the DUI Cost Recovery Program. I was assisted in the inspection by Sergeant Edward Delacruz, #014968. My Area contact for the inspection was Lieutenant Chris Day. Lieutenant Day is the Area Acting Commander and we had discussed the inspection process prior to my arrival. I was aware that Area had proactively self inspected their Reimbursable Services and DUI Cost Recovery files. Lieutenant Day welcomed the Inspection Team to Castro Valley Area, and provided us with a comfortable and private location in which to work. Lieutenant Day was personally involved in the inspection process and was very open to suggestions for improvement.

If you have any questions concerning this memorandum, please contact me at the Santa Rosa Area at (707) 588-1400.

G. P. TRACEY, Lieutenant Field Operations Officer

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command Division CASTRO VLY GOLDEN GA	Chapter ATE 8
Inspected by	Date
G. P. TRACEY 014058	05/27/2009

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required. □ Corrective Action Plan Included TYPE OF INSPECTION Total hours expended on the inspection: □ Division Level □ Command Level Attachments Included ☐ Executive Office Level 4.5 Forward to: 301 Follow-up Required: Due Date: June 30, 2009 X Yes i No gada tara din salah da kingga kingga kingga tarah di salah salah salah salah di salah salah salah salah salah Chapter Inspection: 8 - Command Reimbursable Services Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: None Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: None

Inspector's Findings:

Area will provide proof of county permit approval in RSA file and provide county permit application contact information to requesting parties.

Area will prepare an SOP for RSA to include uniformed approval signature and designated approval in the absence of the commander.

Area will ensure that the original RSA (CHP 465) is signed and filed at Area.

Area will ensure that billing memorandums (CHP 467) are submitted to FMS in a timely manner.

Area will develop a method for officer/supervisor notification to RSA coordinator regarding short notice / cancellation / refund deposit – as well as notification if additional (unexpected) hours and mileage were expended.

Area will develop a manual tracking (date sent) method for the original overtime report transmission to FMS and an email tracking for the overtime report to Division. File copies will be marked accordingly.

Area will ensure that the CHP 71 for reimbursable overtime hours, non-uniformed, are kept in the overtime report file.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command CASTRO VLY	Division. GOLDEN GATE	Chapter. 8
Inspected by G. P. TRACEY	014058	Date: 05/27/2009

Page 2 of 2		
Commander's Response: 风Concur o	or □ Do Not Concur (De Not Conc	ur shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall address no etc.)	on concurrence by commander (e.g., fir	ndings revised, findings unchanged,
Required Action: Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:	opela selganjo silikodija i svenjaka paselini se selektion. Posik selakujo siliki silika periodistra a konstruita i selektion o	
See Commander's Corrective Action Pla	an attached.	
		•
	ψ	
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE OWNER DATE 6-8-09 DATE 6-1-09	
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

Remarks: Division

No

X Yes

N/A

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL INSPECTION PROGRAM

Command: Castro Valley	Golden Gate	Number
Evaluated by G. P. TRACEY	014058	Date 05/27/2009
Assisted by N/A		Date

CHAPTER 8 COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section, Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION Command Level □ Division Level Voluntary Self-Inspection Office of Inspections Commander's Signature: Follow-up Required: Follow-Up Inspection 6-8-09 X Yes For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. Prior to the performance of services, is the Remarks N/A No X Yes contracting party informed of the rates charged for services, departmental equipment usage, and cancellation policy? Does the billing rate include mileage and other Remarks I N/A X Yes T No expenses such as uniform or equipment damage? 3. When a safety service is provided to another state Remarks: ⊠ N/A ☐ No Yes agency, is the agency's five-digit billing code obtained? Is the billing code documented on the Reimbursable Remarks: N/A ☐ Yes □ No Services Billing Memorandum? Is \$50 charged for each CHP uniformed employee Remarks: N/A assigned to the detail if the cancellation notification is ☐ No 🔀 Yes less than 24 hours prior to the scheduled service? 6. Is a minimum payment of 4 hours overtime charged Remarks. N/A No Yes when employee(s) could not be notified of the cancellation of their service(s)? Is information regarding the procedures to obtain Remarks: Area w/provide inquiring N/A X No ☐ Yes necessary right-of-way clearances or permits, local parties with county permit contact requirements, and other pertinent information made available to inquiring parties? Are written requests for specific services directed to Remarks [] N/A □ No Yes the appropriate command? 9. Are traffic control services less than \$50,000 Remarks N/A 図 Yes □ No approved by Division? 10. Are traffic control services estimated to be \$50,000 or Remarks N/A × Yes No more approved by the Office of the Commissioner? 11. Are extraordinary protective services approved by the

Assistant Commissioner, Field?

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8 COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

ions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance de	osits.			
Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks Area corrected
Are advance payments collected from the contracting		☐ No	│ □ N/A	Remarks.
is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks -
Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks.
Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
ons 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agre	ements.			
Is a CHP 466 maintained?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
reimbursable services, followed by two digit iscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks Area CHP 466 in non- sequential Division CHP 466 is sequential
Are all sequential numbers accounted for when	[] Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks
Are sequential numbers not matching Billing	□Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks
Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?		⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks. Area corrected
arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances,	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area corrected.
Is the indemnification clause included in the	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services,	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks*
If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district.	☐Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area has an agreement w/ Alameda County Traffic Improvement Authority no resolution in file
or other local public body? Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office of Dignitary Protection?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
	Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract? Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy? Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service? Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments? Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)? Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169? Is a CHP 466 maintained? Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement? Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001? Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum? Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled? Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area? Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits? Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services? If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit? Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body? Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office	number requested from Division for every contract? Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy? Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service? Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments? Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)? Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169? Is a CHP 466 maintained? Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement? Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number socounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum? Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum? Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled? Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area? Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits? Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services? If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit? Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, distinct, or other local public body? Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office	Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract? Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy? Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service? Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments? Is a CHP 267 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)? Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)? Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169? Is a CHP 466 maintained? Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement? Is the CHP 466 closed out all the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001? Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum? Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled? Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area? Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits? Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services? If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit? Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body? Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office	Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract? Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy? Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service? Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service? Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments? Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)? Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169? Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169? Is a CHP 466 maintained? Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement? Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001? Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum? Are sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum? Are sequential numbers ont matching Billing Memorandums reconciled? Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area? Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits? Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services? If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepa

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

		100000 C 10000	Andrews of the Parket of the Parket		
30	Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: -
	effect? When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement	⊠ Yes	∏ No	□ N/A	Remarks
Quest	Services Division, Field Support Section? ions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pro	cedures a	nd reporti	ng for se	rvices provided.
1	The state of the s	7			
1	Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when iees are collected on the day of the training session?	☐Yes	∏ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks
33	Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks Area corrected
	special projects) within 5 days?				
	Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	⊠ Yes_	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks
35.	Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
36.	Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
37.	Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks Area corrected
38.	billing purposes? Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	⊠Yes	[] No	□ N/A	Remarks.
	to a fine	C COPYLICOS	and reno	rt of over	time hours for reimbursable
Questi	ons 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protectiv	e 5e v.1063	and ropo		
enecia	I projects.			I	
39.	Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks
40.	Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks ACTIA SPC 877
	every contractual service?				
41.	Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks
42.	Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43.	Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:One prior report approved w/o mileage reconciliation.
44.	Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	∑ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
45.	Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks. Area to develop tracking system for submission.
46.	Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:NLT 4 working days after end of FLSA unless extended.

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

		***	Co erre obtioned a proping a proping	The second second	1
47	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?		□ No	∏ N/A	Remarks Division approved copies in Area file
48.	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks*
49.	Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks. Area corrected
50	is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: 4 of 5 RSA are one day
51.	Are all payments made directly to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks
52.	Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: HQ

Memorandum

Date:

June 29, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Golden Gate Division

File No.:

360.14058

Subject:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM - DIVISION LEVEL INSPECTION

2ND QUARTER 2009 - DUBLIN AREA

On June 25, 2009, Inspection Team 2, comprised of Lieutenant G. Tracey, concluded a Division Level inspection of the DUI Cost Recovery Program and Command Reimbursable Services at Dublin Area. The Area contact for the inspection was Lieutenant Lorraine Krolosky.

Area Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, were reviewed for the past twelve months. A random sampling was selected for inspection. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s generally supported the CHP 735, but were not completed in strict accordance with departmental policy. Area was not timely in the submission of the CHP 735 to Fiscal Management Section in most instances.

Area Reimbursable Services Agreements, RSA, were reviewed for the past twelve months. Area engaged in 12 RSA during that time and all of the files were inspected. Area did not collect an advance deposit, in most cases, and was not timely in the submission of the billing memoranda to Fiscal Management Section. Area moved immediately to correct this oversight and has incorporated additional levels of review and training in to RSA procedures.

G. P. TRACEY

Lieutenant

Memorandum

Date:

July 17, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Dublin Area

File No.:

390.11767.11043

Subject:

REIMBURSABLE SERVICES AGREEMENT INSPECTION -

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

On June 25, 2009, a Division-level inspection for the preceding 12-month period was conducted of the Reimbursable Services Agreement files in the Dublin CHP Area. In response to that inspection, the Dublin Area has created this Corrective Action Plan.

HISTORY:

When the Dublin Area learned that the Reimbursable Services Agreement program would be inspected, a thorough self inspection was conducted using the checklist contained in Highway Patrol Manual (HPM) 22.1, Chapter 8. The self inspection was conducted by Lieutenant Lorraine Krolosky, I.D. 11043. The self inspection revealed the following:

- The Dublin Area had twelve (12) reimbursable services agreements. 100% of the agreements were examined.
- The contracts and the associated documents such as time sheets, CHP 465s, receipts and copies of checks were not organized in a central location, therefore; difficult to reconcile immediately.
- The CHP 467s (Billing Memoranda) had not been completed.
- The CHP 466 log had not been updated.
- Fees had not been collected from several vendors.
- There was a general lack of training and accountability for the paperwork transactions and thoroughness of completion of contract requirements.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 July 17, 2009

ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE DIVISION-LEVEL INSPECTION:

- The Dublin Area had twelve (12) reimbursable services agreements. 100% of the agreements were examined.
- Seven of the twelve agreements did not have the deposit collected in advance.
- Area did not submit billing memoranda, CHP 467, in a timely manner.
- Seven of the twelve RSAs had permits in file; one did not require a permit, four of the twelve permits were not present.

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN:

- Sergeant Marino will ensure all policies and procedures are followed for future agreements and a suspense system was created for a monthly audit.
- On-going training will be provided specific to each employee involved in the RSA program.
- Area has created a form to be provided to the requesting party that will indicate how to get the necessary permits, resolutions, etc.
- Area has discussed with the Overtime Coordinator the need for timely notifications of cancellations, refunds, or additional hours and mileage used. In addition, a briefing item will be prepared to inform field personnel of the new requirements. This has been accomplished as of July 1, 2009.
- The overtime documents relating to reimbursable services agreements were consolidated to a central location in June 2009. The reimbursable services agreement file now contains the agreement, other relevant documentation, and the overtime documents (CHP 415 and CHP 71 forms).
- A check for the estimated cost of the services will be collected from the vendor/requestor before any reimbursable services are rendered.
- An Area checklist has been developed to ensure timely completion and submission of required documents.

SUMMARY:

The issues identified during the Division inspection will be addressed and Area will continue to take an active role in managing reimbursable services agreements.

Commander

LM. M. MUELLER, Captain

Memorandum

Date:

July 17, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Dublin Area

File No.:

... 390.11767.11043 :

Subject:

CHP 735 (DUI COST RECOVERY) INSPECTION -

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

On June 25, 2009, a Division-level inspection for the preceding 12-month period was conducted of the CHP 735 (DUI Cost Recovery) files in the Dublin CHP Area. In response to that inspection, the Area has created this Corrective Action Plan.

HISTORY:

Since February 2009, the Dublin Area has been experiencing issues with the completion of CHP 735s in a number of areas. CHP 735s were not being submitted in a timely manner, the time usage was not being reviewed by supervisors, and the forms were not being logged and tracked in an efficient manner. In the March 2009 staff meeting, the sergeants were instructed on the proper documentation of time and the review and timely submission of CHP735s. Field Personnel were briefed on the timeliness and accuracy of the documents. The court officer was directed to forward the chemical test results to the coordinator as soon as they arrived. These steps made a marked improvement in the timeliness of ultimate submission of CHP 735s to Fiscal Management Section (FMS).

When the Dublin Area learned that the DUI Cost Recovery program would be inspected, a thorough self inspection was conducted using the checklist contained in Highway Patrol Manual (HPM) 22.1, Chapter 8. Several issues were identified. The self inspection revealed the following:

- A number of CHP735s were not submitted to FMS in the required time limits.
- There was no Standard Operating Procedure in place for the completion of CHP735s.
- There was no tracking system in place for CHP 735 forms and the optional CHP 735A form was only partially utilized and not in an efficient manner.
- The CHP 415s did not thoroughly break down the necessary categories for time usage by the field officers.
- The chemical test results were not being relayed to Ms. Mohammad in a timely manner to facilitate the forms being sent to FMS as required.

Golden Gate Division Page 2 July 17, 2009

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN:

After identifying the issues, the following corrective action steps were taken:

- March and April 2009, Lt. Krolosky provided training to the Dublin Area sergeants
 relating to the proper review and processing of CHP 735 forms. This training included
 an overview of the program, the proper timekeeping on the CHP 735 and CHP 415s, and
 a review of timely submission of the forms.
- May 2009, Lt. Krolosky provided an Excel spreadsheet used to track CHP 735 forms to Ms. Mohammad for the tracking and routing of the CHP 735s. The spreadsheet included all of the required information as indicated in HPM 11.1, Chapter 20.
- May 2009, Lt. Krolosky created an advanced search in the Area Information System
 (AIS) that was used to determine what DUI-related collisions required a CHP 735 form.
 This search generated a list of collisions for 2008 and 2009. It was determined that all incidents had an associated CHP 735.
- May 2009, the court officer, Officer George Granada was instructed to add Ms.
 Mohammad to the email list of recipients of the blood test results so the results could be documented in a timely manner and the CHP 735s be sent to FMS quicker. Previously, she was receiving via mail approximately one week after the actual results were determined, lengthening the time of submission.
- June 2009, Area SOP was inserted and implemented as to Area's protocol and expectations of the program.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE DIVISION-LEVEL INSPECTION:

- All of the issues identified in the self inspection were discussed with the Division. Inspectors.
- CHP 415s generally supported the CHP735s but were not in strict accordance with departmental policy.
- CHP 735s were not submitted to FMS in a timely manner in most cases.

Golden Gate Division Page 3 July 17, 2009

SUMMARY:

The discrepancies identified during the self inspection and Division inspection were resolved in the following manner. The Dublin Area has adopted Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) to ensure the new CHP 735 procedures are described in detail and departmental policies are adhered to. Measures are in place to ensure the chemical test results are noted on the CHP 735 and routed to FMS in the specified timeframes. Training has been provided to field personnel, supervisors and the office assistant on the proper procedures for the completion of the CHP 735 and associated paperwork. Finally, Area will continue to take an active role in managing and monitoring CHP 735 forms and has implemented a monthly audit program.

M. M. MUELLER, Captain

Commander

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Dublin	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by	armed a new community and a service of	Date.
G. P. Tracey	014058	06/25/2009

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT		G. P. Tracey 014058		06/25/2009
Page 1 of 3				
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter in shall be routed to and its due date. This dimprovement, identified deficiencies, corre	spection number. Und	er Forward to: e	novative practices, suggestio	ns for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command Lev Executive Office Level	inappolion:	expended on the		Action Plan Included ts Included
Follow-up Required:	orward to: 301 ue Date: June 30, 20		a November Odelija i 1900.	SPECT OF STREET OF MIS
Chapter Inspection: 8 - Comma	and Reimbursable	Services		
Inspector's Comments Regarding	ng Innovative Pra	ctices:	e fa _n te de legis (publication filosophication and le	
None				
Command Suggestions for Stat	ewide Improveme	ent:		
None				
Inspector's Findings:				
Area had 12 reimbursable service period were inspected.	es agreements, F	SA, in the pa	ast 12 months. All RS	SA for that time
of 12 agreements did not have	the deposit collec	cted in advan	ce.	
Area did not submit billing memor	anda, CHP 467,	in a timely m	anner.	
of 12 RSA had permits in file, 1	did not require a	permit, 4 of	12 a permits were not	present.
trea has instruction and example epartmental policy too. Area has versight and training to ensure fu	s a primary conta	ct for RSA. 7	Area is incorporating	has the applicable additional levels of
Commander's Response: 💋 Co	ncur or 🗍 Do No	Concur (Do	Not Concur shall docume	nt basis for response)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Dublin	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
Inspected by: G. P. Trace		Date: 06/25/2009

Page 2 of 3

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

Required Action:

Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:

See Commander's Corrective Action Plan attached.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

G. P. Tracey 014058

Command

Dublin

Division

Golden Gate

8 Date 06/25/2009

Chapter

Page 3 of 3

[] (-inployee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	17/10/09
(See 1194/5.1. Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	INSPECTOR SSIGNATURE	6-29-09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	1 15 10 S
Concur Do not concur	L (and the same of the same of the same of

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL INSPECTION PROGRAM CHAPTER 8 COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command: Dublin	Division: Golden Gate	Number:
Evaluated by: G. P. Tracey 014058		Date: 06/25/2009
Assisted by: N/A	011000	Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

		Ol and Indian	ctor's Signatu	ro'		
TYPE OF INSPECTION	,	Lead Inspec	CIOI & SIGIIALL		- 2	
		(-	mac		
☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level		(DEG	mac	K 9	
Office of Inspections Voluntary Se	of-Inspection		U Consulura	· 		Date:
Follow-up Required: Follow-U	o Inspection	Commande	r's Signature	. 0		7/10/09
Yes No BY:			سرلير			1/10/2001
						
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, C	Chapter 6.					
					1117	
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Ren	natks"isection:	shall be uti	lized for ex	planation		\$ 135 \ A 1
	ne				Remarks:	
Prior to the performance of services, is in contracting party informed of the rates characters.	narged for	Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Kemarks.	
services, departmental equipment usage	, and	1				
cancellation policy?						
2 Does the hilling rate include mileage and	other	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
expenses such as uniform or equipment	damager	<u> </u>		- Anni - I		
When a safety service is provided to and when a safety service is provided to and	ode	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
agency, is the agency's five-digit billing of	,000					0,
obtained? 4. Is the billing code documented on the Re	eimbursable			C-74	Remarks:	
Carvices Billing Memorandum?	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A		J
5 le \$50 charged for each CHP uniformed	employee	57.	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
ancioned to the detail if the cancellation	nothication is	Yes	[] NO			
less than 24 hours prior to the scheduled	servicer					
6. Is a minimum payment of 4 hours overting	ne charged	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
when employee(s) could not be notified of cancellation of their service(s)?	of the					
7. Is information regarding the procedures	lo obtain		5220.7	(mm ²)	Remarks: A	rea will provide permit
necessary right-of-way clearances of per	miles, local	☐ Yes	No	□ N/A	application	nto to requesting parties.
requirements, and other pertinent inform	ation made					
available to inquiring parties?	500					و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و
8. Are written requests for specific services	directed to		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
the appropriate command?		N 100				
Are traffic control services less than \$50.	000	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
approved by Division? 10. Are traffic control services estimated to be	e \$50,000 or				Remarks:	
more approved by the Office of the Com	missioner?		□ No	□ N/A	Lemons.	
11. Are extraordinary protective services app	proved by the		—	I N/A	Remarks:	
Assistant Commissioner, Field?			□ No	1 1V/A	J	

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL INSPECTION PROGRAM CHAPTER 8 COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance de	posits.	HAIN		
12 Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log number requested from Division for every contract?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□N/A	Remarks: Area corrected this exception.
15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?	⊠ Yes	[] No	□N/A	Remarks:
16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal Management Section upon completion of the contractual service(s)?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area has corrected this exception as of June 2009.
17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 altached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Verilied on 0317,0407,0413
Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agr	eements.			
18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?	∀es	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19 Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?	∑ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22. Are sequential numbers not matching Billing Memorandums reconciled?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Division handles.
23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?	⊠ Yes	∏ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24. Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?		□ No	□N/A	Remarks:
26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:
28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body?	⊠ Yes	□No	□N/A	Remarks: Cily of Dublin RSA
29 Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office	⊠ Yes	□ No	[] N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
INSPECTION PROGRAM
CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

30	Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	VVhen state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Quest	Services Division, Field Support Section? Ions 32 through 38 perfain to training agreement pro	cedures	nd reporti	ng for se	rvices provided:
15.45	Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	Yes	□ No	[X] N/A	Remarks:
33	Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area has corrected this exception as of June 2009.
34.	special projects) within 5 days? Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?		□No	□N/A	Remarks:
35.	Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
36.	Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
37.	Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
38.	Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questi	ons 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protective	e services	and repo	rt of over	rime nonte ior teninon eaple
special 39.	Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
40.	Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□N/A	Remarks:
41.	Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	Yes	□No	[] N/A	Remarks:
	Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43.	Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
44.	Are overlime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	[] N/A	Remarks:
45.	Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
46.	Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10" of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
INSPECTION PROGRAM
CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

47	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Division handles.
49.	Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?	⊠ Yes	∏ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
50.	Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	⊠ Yes	□ No	[] N/A	Remarks:
51.	Are all payments made directly to FMS?	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
52.	Does the command require delinquent companies to pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any future services?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks. HQ handles.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Dublin	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
Inspected by: G. P. Tracey		Date: 06/10/2009

Page 1 of 3 INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be fulled to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required. TYPE OF INSPECTION	LAGEI HORO DOGGINE	4 1	0.1	, Hacey OT+CC	00/10/2200
number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be routed innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP \$1 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required. TYPE OF INSPECTION	Page 1 of 3				
Special Spe	number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This	Inspection documer	n number. Under "Forwant shall be utilized to doc	ard to:" enter the ne ument innovative pr	xt level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide
Follow-up Required: Yes		.evel		on the	○ Corrective Action Plan Included
Due Date: June 30, 2009 Chapter Inspection: 8 — DUI Cost Recovery Program Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: None Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Area recommends the A415 "Notes" section be modified to support the required CHP 735 staff activity documentation. Area recommends consideration of a drop down menu with the 11 staff activity(s) pre- dighted with a space for the time increments to be documented. Inspector's Findings: Area prepared 98 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, in the past twelve months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	Executive Office Level		3		Attachments Included
Chapter Inspection: 8 – DUI: Cost Recovery Program Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: None Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Area recommends the A415 "Notes" section be modified to support the required CHP 735 staff activity documentation. Area recommends consideration of a drop down menu with the 11 staff activity(s) pre-lighted with a space for the time increments to be documented. Inspector's Findings: Area prepared 98 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, in the past twelve months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	Follow-up Required:	Forward	d to: 301		
Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: None Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Area recommends the A415 "Notes" section be modified to support the required CHP 735 staff activity documentation. Area recommends consideration of a drop down menu with the 11 staff activity(s) predighted with a space for the time increments to be documented. Inspector's Findings: Area prepared 98 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, in the past twelve months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	⊠ Yes □ No	Due Da	te: June 30, 2009		
Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Area recommends the A415 "Notes" section be modified to support the required CHP 735 staff activity documentation. Area recommends consideration of a drop down menu with the 11 staff activity(s) predighted with a space for the time increments to be documented. Inspector's Findings: Area prepared 98 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, in the past twelve months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	Chapter Inspection: 8 - DUI:	Cost Re	covery Program		
Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Area recommends the A415 "Notes" section be modified to support the required CHP 735 staff activity documentation. Area recommends consideration of a drop down menu with the 11 staff activity(s) predighted with a space for the time increments to be documented. Inspector's Findings: Area prepared 98 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, in the past twelve months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	Inspector's Comments Regar	ding In	novative Practices		
Area recommends the A415 "Notes" section be modified to support the required CHP 735 staff activity documentation. Area recommends consideration of a drop down menu with the 11 staff activity(s) predighted with a space for the time increments to be documented. Inspector's Findings: Area prepared 98 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, in the past twelve months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	None				
Area prepared 98 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, in the past twelve months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	Command Suggestions for St	atewide	e Improvement:		
Area prepared 98 Incident Response Reimbursement Statements, CHP 735, in the past twelve months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	documentation. Area recomm	ends co	onsideration of a d	rop down meni	e required CHP 735 staff activity u with the 11 staff activity(s) pre-
months. 25 statements were selected randomly and inspected. 10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal Management Section, FMS, within policy timelines. 4 of 25 were prepared without the "Date to Fiscal Management" box completed. 1 of 25 was submitted to FMS twice. 100% of the CHP 735s had the Daily Field Record, CHP 415, attached. The CHP 415s supported the CHP 735 though they were not completed in strict accordance with the Administrative Procedures Manual, HPM 11.1, Chpt 6.	Inspector's Findings:				
Commandaria Pagnanga: [] Conque or [] Do Not Conque (Do Not Conque shall degument basis for response)	months. 25 statements w Management Section, FM Fiscal Management" box of 100% of the CHP 735s hat the CHP 735 though they	ere sele S, within completed and the D were no	ected randomly ar in policy timelines. ted. 1 of 25 was si vaily Field Record, ot completed in st	id inspected. 1 4 of 25 were pubmitted to FM CHP 415, atta	10 of 25 were submitted to Fiscal prepared without the "Date to S twice. ached. The CHP 415s supported
Continuance is inesponse. Contour of Do Not Contour Strain document basis for response)	Commander's Response: 🔲 (Concur	or 🗌 Do Not Cond	our (Do Not Cond	cur shall document basis for response)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Page 2 of 3

Command:	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
Dublin Inspected by: G. P. Tracey		Date: 06/10/2009

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, elc.)

Required Action: Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:

See Commander's Corrective Action Plan attached.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command: Dublin	Division: Golden Gate	Chapter:
Inspected by: G. P. Tracey	014058	Date: 06/10/2009

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

Division: Golden Gate	Number:
Evaluated by: G. P. Tracey 014058	
	Date:
	Golden Gate

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signati	ure:	-	1/- //
1	Command Level					
Office of Inspections	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection					
Follow-up Required:	Follow-Up Inspection	Command	er's Signature	i i koosii	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Date:
Yes No	BY:					
For applicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 20.					
		<u> </u>		mar Too week		
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is che 1. Does the command have		shall be ut	ilized for ex	kplanation T		Hall (Miles and)
ensure that a CHP 735, In	cident Response	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
Reimbursement State mer arrest that meets the cost	it, is prepared for each					
What are these procedure		1			L	
Area has undated a COD that	dataila saganaihilitiaa for aiy	illong offic	ore serges	nte and m	nanadere re	garding the DU
Area has updated a SOP that Cost Recovery Program.	details responsibilities for civ	mans, onc	ers, serges	iills ailu ii	ianayers re	garding the bot
, ,						
 Does the command have a assigned to process all CH 		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
4. If the answer to question 3					Damestra	
the responsibility of proces listed in their job descriptio		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

5.	Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
6.	Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal)	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
7.	Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates? • The date of BAC results of ≈.08% were received • The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: 50% on time record to improve with heightened oversight.
8.	Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area checks court dispositions in a more timely manner after updating SOP following self inspection.
9.	Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks; None to date.
	Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Updated SOP – Briefing to correct
14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None to date.
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
18. Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: 2009
19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command transfer updated the SOP regarding the DUI Cost Recovery Progra735s.				
 20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: AIS / Court Records

INSPECTION PROGRAM

	FMS Information BAC test results				
21.	Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: 735A / AIS Tracking
22.	Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23.	Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questio	on 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.			Yak Pilet	
25.	Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

State of California

Memorandum

Date:

July 1, 2009

To:

Golden Gate Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Oakland Area

File No .:

370.12322

- Subject:

RESPONSE TO OAKLAND AREA COMMAND DUI COST-RECOVERY

INSPECTION REPORT

This memorandum is intended to serve as the written response to the draft command DUI cost recovery inspection report of the Oakland Area.

FINDINGS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP:

Finding 1 - Agree

Finding 2 - Agree.

Finding 3 - Agree.

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN:

After completion of a self inspection, all Oakland Area personnel were briefed on the requirements for and proper completion the CHP 735, Incident Response Reimbursement Statement, and associated CHP 415s, Daily Field Record. The self inspection and subsequent Division-level inspection also identified deficiencies in adequate tracking of CHP 735s and timely submission. The Oakland Area has made immediate changes in the procedures for the submission, processing, and tracking of incidents that meet the DUI cost recovery criteria. Those revisions have been disseminated to the appropriate Area personnel and the Area SOP has been revised to incorporate those changes.

Area has created a processing checklist to be attached to each CHP 735 by the reviewing sergeant. In addition to the necessary tracking information, the checklist includes questions to ensure the proper submission of the cost recovery form and associated documents. The checklist must be completed by the reviewing sergeant, Court Liaison Officers, and the clerical employee responsible for submission of CHP 735s. Upon submission for approval, the checklist will be signed by the Area commander or designee and filed with Area copies of the documents.

Safety, Service, and Security

Golden Gate Division Page 2 July 1, 2009

Primary and alternate DUI Cost Recovery supervisors have been selected to oversee the submission, tracking, and verification process. On a minimum of a monthly basis, those supervisors will compare the submitted CHP 735s listed on the CHP 735A, Case Log—Dui Cost Recovery Program, with the number of investigated collisions involving impaired drivers, utilizing AIS. A list, if any, of missing CHP 735s will be sent to Area management by the 5th of each month.

A server directory has been created to maintain, by year, electronic versions of the CHP 735A; the directory is accessible by Area managers, supervisors, Court Liaison Officers, and appropriate support staff. A separate CHP 735A will be maintained for suspected impaired drivers who submit to breath tests, blood/urine tests, or refused to complete any of the required chemical tests, for a total of three logs. This will aide in the tracking of blood/urine test results and convictions (for refusals) by the DUI Cost Recovery supervisors, clerical employee, and/or the Court Liaison Officers. The status of those cases will be checked on a minimum of once per week.

The DUI Cost Recovery supervisors will conduct quarterly inspections of the command files to confirm compliance with Department policies and Area SOP. A member of Area management will conduct periodic spot checks to verify compliance.

The corrective action plan has been successfully completed, with all Findings being addressed and all recommendations implemented. Therefore, this will serve as a final report and no quarterly updates will be necessary

Questions regarding this response may be directed to Lieutenant B. J. Whitten or me at (510) 450-3821.

D. E. MORRELL, Captain

Commander

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Oakland	Golden Gate	8
Inspected by:		Date:
G.P. Tracev 014058		June 24, 2009

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter I shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, corr	Inspecti docume	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to do	ard to:" enter the cument innovative	pr fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter next level of command where the document practices, suggestions for statewide to be used if additional space is required.
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command Le	land of the		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included	
Executive Office Level		2.5		Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:	7.	5 I
⊠ Yes □ No	Due D	ate:		
Chapter Inspection: 8 - DUI C	OST	RECOVERY PRO	GRAM	
Inspector's Comments Regard	ling In	novative Practices		
None		0.7010		
Command Suggestions for Sta	atewid	e Improvement:		
None				
Inspector's Findings:				
88 of 70 available Incident Respondent Respondenths. Area had more qualifying preparation / files.	se Rei incide	mbursement Statements during the prior	ents, CHP 735 twelve months	, were inspected from the prior twelve s than were accounted for by CHP 735
area does not have an adequate trac timely manner.	cking :	system to ensure that	the CHP 735	is prepared, approved and submitted in
area self inspected prior to the Divisor recovery.	ision I	Level inspection and	is making cor	rections to local procedures for DUI
ee Commander's Corrective Actio	n Plan	attached.		
Commander's Response: 🗵 Co	oncur	or Do Not Cond	cur (Do Not Co	ncur shall document basis for response)
nspector's Comments: Shall add	dress r	on concurrence by co	mmander (e.g.,	findings revised, findings unchanged,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

- 1	inspeci	led by.	
	G.P.	Tracey	014058

Command:

Oakland

Division: Chapter: 8 Golden Gate

Date:

June 24, 2009

Page 2 of 2

Required Action:	3 1 2)
6.		100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:		

After completion of a self inspection, all Oakland Area personnel were briefed on the requirements for and proper completion the CHP 735, Incident Response Reimbursement Statement, and associated CHP 415s, Daily Field Record. The self inspection and subsequent Division-level inspection also identified deficiencies in adequate tracking of CHP 735s and timely submission. The Oakland Area has made immediate changes in the procedures for the submission, processing, and tracking of incidents that meet the DUI cost recovery criteria. Those revisions have been disseminated to the appropriate Area personnel and the Area SOP is currently being revised to incorporate those changes.

Area has created a processing checklist to be attached to each CHP 735 by the reviewing sergeant. In addition to the necessary tracking information, the checklist includes questions to ensure the proper submission of the cost recovery form and associated documents. The checklist must be completed by the reviewing sergeant, Court Liaison Officers, and the clerical employee responsible for submission of CHP 735s. Upon submission for approval, the checklist will be signed by the Area commander or designee and filed with Area copies of the documents.

Primary and alternate DUI Cost Recovery supervisors have been selected to oversee the submission, tracking, and verification process. On a minimum of a monthly basis, those supervisors will compare the submitted CHP 735s listed on the CHP 735A, Case Log-Dui Cost Recovery Program, with the number of investigated collisions involving impaired drivers, utilizing AIS. A list, if any, of missing CHP 735s will be sent to Area management by the 5th of each month.

A server directory has been created to maintain, by year, electronic versions of the CHP 735A; the directory is accessible by Area managers, supervisors, Court Liaison Officers, and appropriate support staff. A separate CHP 735A will be maintained for suspected impaired drivers who submit to breath tests, blood/urine tests, or refused to complete any of the required chemical tests, for a total of three logs. This will aide in the tracking of blood/urine test results and convictions (for refusals) by the DUI Cost Recovery supervisors, clerical employee, and/or the Court Liaison Officers. The status of those cases will be checked on a minimum of once per week.

The DUI Cost Recovery supervisors will conduct quarterly inspections of the command files to confirm compliance with Department policies and Area SOP. A member of Area management will conduct periodic spot checks to verify compliance.

Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE	
the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	1 mels	7-1-2009	
(See Tir M 9.1, Chapter 6 for appear procedures.)	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE	
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE	
☐ Concur ☐ Do not concur			

Page

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

Command: Oakland	Division: Golden Gate	Number:
Evaluated by: G.P. Tracey	014058	Date: 06/24/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

NSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspendentionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be docume command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and on	ections shal nted on an p and/or co	l be comme Exceptions I rrective actio	nted on via Document a on(s) taken	the "Remark and addresse . If this form	s" section. ed to the next level of
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Inspe	ctor's Signatu	ire:		
☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level					
☐ Office of Inspections ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection					
Follow-up Required:	Commando	er's Signature	cı	U	Date: 7-1-09
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 20.					
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	planation.		
 Does the command have sufficient procedures to ensure that a CHP 735, incident Response Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria? 	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	incidents in t	ea has more qualifying he last twelve months e CHP 735s in file.
2. What are these procedures?					
Does the command have a specific employee(s) assigned to process all CHP 735 forms?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms listed in their job description or any other document?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	

INSPECTION PROGRAM

 Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) properly with completed criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form? 	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area was not timely in submission but is self correcting.
 6. Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08% A chemical test is positive for drugs only There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal) 	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area will retrain all personnel involved in the submission/tracking of CHP 735s. Area will attempt to use court inquiry systems to expedite conviction date notifications.
7. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates?	☐Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area is correcting with tracking form.
 The date of BAC results of =.08% were received The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver 				
 8. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following? The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test The arrest was for drugs only A BAC of < .08% was obtained 	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area is correcting.
9. Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Currently
10. If the person arrested is transient, is the case being entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735 to FMS?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None to date.
11. Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Do the total number of staff hours charged on the CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily Field Record?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Some 735s missing 415s. Supervisors and officers have been re-briefed on policy.

Page 3 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

			Company of the latest and the latest	The state of the s
13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Currently
 14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735? Response Time On-Scene Investigation Follow-up Investigation Report Writing Vehicle Storage Call Back Field Sobriety Testing Transportation Booking Chemical Testing Traffic Control 	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Currently
15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge; sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None to date
16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
18. Is the command utilizing the, optional, CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command tra	acking the	DUI Cost F	Recovery F	Program?
 20. Are commands using a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program including the following information in the monitoring system? Defendant Information Violation Information Court Information FMS Information BAC test results 	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area is correcting this oversight.

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

21. Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area is correcting.
22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks; Area is correcting.
23. Are refunds or overpayments, as a result of erroneous charges, in an amount of = \$5.00 being processed by the Department?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.				The state of the s
25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: HQ

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Division:		Chapter:
Oakland Golden Gate		8
Inspected by:	Dale:	
G. P. Tracev	06/24/2009	

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, continued to the co	Inspecti docume	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to doc	ard to:" enter the ne sument innovative pr	ill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter xt level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide e used if additional space is required.		
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Total hours expended on the		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included			
□ Division Level □ Command Level		inspection:				
Executive Office Level		2		Attachments Included		
Follow-up Required: Forward to: 301						
⊠ Yes □ No	Due D	ate: June 30, 2009				
Chapter Inspection: 8 -COMI	MAND	REIMBURSABLE	SERVICES			
Inspector's Comments Regar	dina Ir	novative Practices	: :			
None						
Command Suggestions for St	atewic	le Improvement:				
None						
Inspector's Findings:						
25 Letters of Agreement, CHP	465, ii	n file for prior 12 m	onths. 5 were	inspected.		
The majority of agreements are	e one (day professional/ar	nateur sports o	lub "escorts."		
Area should focus on the subm locumentation, within required		_	nda, CHP 467,	with correct supporting		
iles should include a copy of t Records, CHP 415, to support				eceipt, CHP 251, and Daily Field		
ee Commander's Corrective A	Action	Plan attached.				
Commander's Response: 🗵 🤇	Concu	r or 🗌 Do Not Con	cur (Do Not Cond	ur shall document basis for response)		
Harry and the state of the stat						
Inspector's Comments: Shall a	ddress	non concurrence by co	ommander (e.g., f	indings revised, findings unchanged,		

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:		
Oakland	Golden Gate	8		
Inspected by:	Date:			
G. P. Tracey 014058		06/24/2009		

DATE

Required Action:
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline:
The Area self inspection and subsequent Division-level inspection identified deficiencies in the maintaining of copies of all associated documents in command files and timely submission of the CHP 467, <i>Billing Memorandum - Reimbursable Services</i> . The Oakland Area has made immediate changes in the procedures for the submission, processing, and tracking of reimbursable services agreements. Those revisions have been disseminated to the appropriate Area personnel and the Area SOP is currently being revised to incorporate those changes.
Primary and alternate Reimbursable Services supervisors have been selected to oversee the submission, tracking, and verification process. Area has created a processing checklist to be attached to each request for reimbursable services. The checklist must be completed by the appropriate sergeant, Area Overtime Coordinator, and/or the clerical employee responsible for submission of reimbursable services agreements. Upon submission for approval, the checklist will be signed by the Area commander or designee and filed with Area copies of the documents.
A server directory has been created to maintain, by year, electronic versions of the CHP 466, <i>Reimbursable Services Control Log (Under \$50,000)</i> ; the directory is accessible by Area managers, supervisors, and appropriate support staff. The Reimbursable Services supervisors will conduct quarterly inspections of the command files to confirm compliance with Department policies and Area SOP. A member of Area management will conduct periodic spot checks to verify compliance.

COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE

Page

Remarks:

□ N/A

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Command: Oakland	Division: Golden Gate	Number:
Evaluated by: G. P. Tracey 0	Date: 06/24/2009	
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION □ Division Level Command Level Office of Inspections ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Follow-up Required: Commander's Signature: ☐ Follow-Up Inspection ⊠ Yes 7-1-09 BY:____ For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1. Chapter 6. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Prior to the performance of services, is the Remarks: contracting party informed of the rates charged for ☐ No ☐ N/A services, departmental equipment usage, and cancellation policy? 2. Does the billing rate include mileage and other Remarks: expenses such as uniform or equipment damage? П No X Yes □ N/A When a safety service is provided to another state Remarks: agency, is the agency's five-digit billing code X Yes □ No □ N/A obtained? 4. Is the billing code documented on the Reimbursable Services Billing Memorandum? Remarks: X Yes M No N/A 5. Is \$50 charged for each CHP uniformed employee Remarks: assigned to the detail if the cancellation notification is Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A less than 24 hours prior to the scheduled service? 6. Is a minimum payment of 4 hours overtime charged when employee(s) could not be notified of the Remarks: X Yes □ No □ N/A cancellation of their service(s)? 7. Is information regarding the procedures to obtain Remarks: necessary right-of-way clearances or permits, local X Yes ☐ No N/A requirements, and other pertinent information made available to inquiring parties? 8. Are written requests for specific services directed to Remarks: the appropriate command? □ N/A X Yes □ No Are traffic control services less than \$50,000 Remarks: approved by Division? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A 10. Are traffic control services estimated to be \$50,000 or Remarks: more approved by the Office of the Commissioner? ☐ N/A ☐ No 11. Are extraordinary protective services approved by the

X Yes

No

Assistant Commissioner, Field?

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

Questions	12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance de	posits.			
nun	Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log observed from Division for every contract?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
poli		⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
con	advance payments collected from the contracting pany prior to the start of the service?		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting pany upon receipt of advance payments?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Not present in one file inspected.
Mar	CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal agement Section upon completion of the ractual service(s)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
CHF	copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questions	18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agr	eements.			
18. Is a	CHP 466 maintained?	223126745476767678	Market Control of the	NO STREET OF STREET	
		✓ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
reim year num	RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote bursable services, followed by two digit fiscal three digit location code, and a sequential ber for each agreement?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
year with	e CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning the sequential number 001?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area to correct with implementation of local CHP 466
recor	all sequential numbers accounted for when nothing with the Billing Memorandum?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	equential numbers not matching Billing orandums reconciled?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: One R# for 2007 had 2006 indicator.
23. Is the	original RSA signed and filed at Area?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Copies only.
arran has o and p	the command proceed with all RSA gements, and if needed, ensure the requestor btained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, ermits?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
agree	indemnification clause included in the ment when requested?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
аррго	inclusion of the indemnification clause ved by the Department of General Services, of Legal Services?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
CHP 7	service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a 78R prepared and submitted to Contract es Unit?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
ordina one of or othe	opy of the resolution, order, motion, or nce of the local governing body obtained when the contracting parties is a county, city, district, er local public body?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None inspected.
	gnitary protection services referred to the Office nitary Protection?	⊠ Yes	Пио	□ N/A	Remarks:

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

					The state of the s
30	O. Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467 forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in effect?	⊠ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area to use all required forms for future DIR/WCAB stand by services.
31	When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Quest	tions 32 through 38 pertain to training agreement pr	ocedures	and report	ting for se	rvices provided.
32	2. Is a CHP 230 prepared by the contracting party when fees are collected on the day of the training session?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
33	B. Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area to improve upon timely submission by incorporating training for involved personnel and additional oversight for timelines.
34	. Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
35	Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Area to correct.
36.	Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
37.	Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
38.	Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questi special	ons 39 through 52 pertain to extraordinary protectiv I projects.	e services	and repo	ort of over	time hours for reimbursable
39.	Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Division Handles
	Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
43.	Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
45.	Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
46. [s a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 th of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?	⊠ Yes	Пио	□ N/A	Remarks:

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

INSPECTION PROGRAM

CHAPTER 8

47. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to Division by the 15 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□No	∏ N/A	Remarks:
48. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 th of the month?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
49. Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniforme personnel hours?	ed 🗆 Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None Checked
50. Is an amendment of service agreement requested prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is the service discontinued?	s 🛭 Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
51. Are all payments made directly to FMS?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
52. Does the command require delinquent companies t pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing an future services?	0	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: HQ